SAN FRANCISCO PUBLIC LIBRARY
3 1223 10055 7462

5/S

San Francisco Public Library

Government Information Center
San Francisco Public Library
100 Larkin Street, 5th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94102

REFERENCE BOOK

Not to be taken from the Library

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2014

https://archive.org/details/ordinance1993sanf_0

3 1223 10055 7462

FILE NO. 101-92-48

(Government Funding)

ORDINANCE NO. 101-93

RO# 92189 SA# 85

APPROPRIATING $373,000 FOR TEMPORARY SALARIES, OVERTIME, MANDATORY FRINGE BENEFITS, VEHICLE RENTAL AND MATERIALS AND SUPPLIES, PARKING AND TRAFFIC FOR FISCAL YEAR 1992 - 93.

Be it ordained by the people of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. FUNDS ARE HEREBY APPROPRIATED FOR FY 1992-93 AS FOLLOWS:

Department and Number	Source of Funds and Purpose of Appropriation	Amount Debit	Amount Credit
01 - 001	**General Fund**		
99 - 00 - 00	**General Fund Unallocated**		
GL 496 (000026)	Unappropriated Revenue Reserved		
Subsidiary 000006	General Reserve	$373,000	
49-4900 ( )	Revenue Transfer Out to #02-071, Off-Street Parking Fund		$373,000
	Total - General Fund Unallocated	$373,000	$373,000
02 - 071	**Off - Street Parking Fund**		
36 - 05 - 04	**Parking and Traffic - Meters**		
99-9990 ( )	Revenue Transfer In From #01-001, General Fund Unallocated	$373,000	
02-0200 (353284)	Temporary Salaries		$94,293
03-0100	Overtime		26,935
04-0600	Mandatory Fringe Benefits		8,372
10-1204	Vehicle Rental		8,400
11-1300	Materials and Supplies		235,000
	Total - Off-Street Parking Fund	$373,000	$373,000

Supervisor Migden, Alioto

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

APPROVED AS TO FORM:
LOUISE H. RENNE, CITY ATTORNEY

BY: [signature]
DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY

FUNDS AVAILABLE:

[signature]
CONTROLLER

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

DOCUMENTS DEPT.
MAY 3 - 1993
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

Board of Supervisors, San Francisco

Passed for Second Reading	Finally Passed
April 5, 1993	April 12, 1993
Ayes: Supervisors Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Kaufman Maher Migden Shelley	Ayes: Supervisors Achtenberg Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Kaufman Kennedy Maher Migden Shelley
Excused [redacted]: Supervisor Hsieh	Absent [redacted]: Supervisor Hsieh
Absent: Supervisors Achtenberg Kennedy	

I hereby certify that the foregoing ordinance was finally passed by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco

John L. Taylor
Clerk

File No.
101-92-48

APR 19 1993
Date Approved

Frank M. Jordan
Mayor

FILE NO. 101-92-49

ORDINANCE NO. 102-93

(Government Funding)

RO# 92190 SA# 67

APPROPRIATING $2,500,000 FOR CLAIMS AND JUDGEMENT, MUNICIPAL RAILWAY FOR FISCAL YEAR 1992 - 93.

Be it ordained by the people of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. FUNDS ARE HEREBY APPROPRIATED FOR FY 1992-93 AS FOLLOWS:

Department and Number	Source of Funds and Purpose of Appropriation	Amount Debit	Amount Credit
01 - 001	**General Fund**		
99 - 00 - 00	General Fund Unallocated		
GL 496 (000026)	Unappropriated Revenue Reserved		
Subsidiary 000006	General Reserve	$2,500,000	
48-4700 (841601)	Contribution Transfer Out to # 31 - 001, Municipal Railway Operating Fund		$2,500,000
	Total - General Fund	**$2,500,000**	**$2,500,000**
31 - 001	**Municipal Railway Operating Fund**		
35 - 00 - 00	Municipal Railway		
98-9701 (196113)	Contribution Transfer In From # 01 - 001, General Fund Unallocated	$2,500,000	
14-1450 (560979)	Judgement and Claims		$2,500,000
	Total - Municipal Railway Operating Fund	**$2,500,000**	**$2,500,000**

Supervisor Migden, Alioto

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

APPROVED AS TO FORM:
LOUISE H. RENNE, CITY ATTORNEY

BY: [signature]
DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY

FUNDS AVAILABLE:

[signature]
CONTROLLER

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

DOCUMENTS DEPT.
MAY 3 - 1993
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

Board of Supervisors, San Francisco

Passed for Second Reading	Finally Passed
April 5, 1993	April 12, 1993
Ayes: Supervisors Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Maher Migden Shelley	Ayes: Supervisors Achtenberg Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Kaufman Kennedy Maher Migden Shelley
Absent: Supervisors Achtenberg Kennedy	Absent: Supervisor Hsieh

I hereby certify that the foregoing ordinance was finally passed by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco.

John L. Taylor
Clerk

File No.
101-92-49

APR 19 1993
Date Approved

Frank M. Jordan
Mayor

FILE NO. 101-92-50 ORDINANCE NO. 103-93

(Government Funding) RO# 92191 SA# 68

APPROPRIATING $3,235,100 FOR PERMANENT SALARIES - MISCELLANEOUS, PERMANENT SALARIES - UNIFORM, PREMIUM PAY - UNIFORM, DIFFERENTIAL PAY, OVERTIME - UNIFORM AND MANDATORY FRINGE BENEFITS AND RESCINDING $850,000 FROM OTHER FRINGE BENEFITS, POLICE DEPARTMENT FOR FISCAL 1992 - 93; SUBJECT OF PREVIOUS BUDGETARY DENIAL.

Be it ordained by the people of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. FUNDS ARE HEREBY APPROPRIATED FOR FY 1992-93 AS FOLLOWS:

Department and Number	Source of Funds and Purpose of Appropriation	Amount Debit	Amount Credit
02 - 005	**Narcotics Forfeiture & Seizure Fund**		
38 - 00 - 00	**Police Department**		
Project 001 - 01	Revenue - Narcotics Fund		
65-6531 (050062)	Narcotics Forfeiture	$250,000	
49-4900 (915256)	Revenue Transfer Out to # 01-001, General Fund		$250,000
	Total - Narcotics Forfeiture & Seizure Fund	$250,000	$250,000
01 - 001	**General Fund**		
GL 496 (000026)	Unappropriated Revenue Reserved		
Subsidiary 000006	General Reserve	$2,135,100	
38 - 00 - 00	Police Department		
99-9990 (234757)	Revenue Transfer In From # 02 -005, Narcotics Seizure and Forfeiture Fund	250,000	
04-0710 (580019)	Other Fringe Benefits	850,000	
01-0010	Permanent Salaries - Miscellaneous		$570,000
01-0020	Permanent Salaries - Uniform		470,000
01-0190	Premium Pay - Uniform		510,000
02-0140	Differential Pay		175,000
03-0101	Overtime - Uniform		1,369,642
04-0602	Retirement		140,458
	Total - General Fund	$3,235,100	$3,235,100

Section 2. This Ordinance is adopted by a two-thirds vote of all members of the Board of Supervisors pursuant to Section 6.306 of the Charter. These items were previously requested by Budget Estimate and denied by the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors.

APPROVED AS TO FORM:
LOUISE H. RENNE, CITY ATTORNEY

BY: [signature]
DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY

FUNDS AVAILABLE:
[signature]
CONTROLLER

Supervisor Migden, Alioto

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

DOCUMENTS DEPT.
MAY 3 - 1993
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

Board of Supervisors, San Francisco

Passed for Second Reading	Finally Passed
April 5, 1993	April 12, 1993
Ayes: Supervisors Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Maher Migden Shelley	Ayes: Supervisors Achtenberg Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Kaufman Kennedy Maher Migden Shelley
Absent: Supervisors Achtenberg Kennedy	Absent: Supervisor Hsieh

I hereby certify that the foregoing ordinance was finally passed by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco

John L. Taylor
Clerk

File No.
101-92-50

APR 19 1993
Date Approved

Frank M. Jordan
Mayor

FILE NO. 101-92-51 ORDINANCE NO. 104-93

(Government Funding) RO# 92153 SA# 44 & 62

APPROPRIATING $255,000 FOR PERMANENT SALARIES - MISCELLANEOUS, PREMIUM PAY - MISCELLANEOUS AND RELATED MANDATORY FRINGE BENEFITS, FOR THE CREATION OF (10) TEN POSITIONS, POLICE DEPARTMENT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1992-93; PROVIDING FOR RATIFICATION OF ACTION PREVIOUSLY TAKEN.

Be it ordained by the people of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. FUNDS ARE HEREBY APPROPRIATED FOR FY 1992-93 AS FOLLOWS:

Department and Number	Source of Funds and Purpose of Appropriation	Amount Debit	Amount Credit
01 - 001	General Fund		
G.L. 496 (000026)	Unappropriated Revenue Reserved		
Subsidiary 000006	General Reserve	$255,000	
38 - 00 - 00	Police Department		
01-0010 (580019)	Permanent Salaries		$193,190
01-0180	Premium Pay		6,220
04-0600	Mandatory Fringe Benefits		55,590
	Total	$255,000	$255,000

Section 2. Funds are hereby appropriated for ten (10) positions created by amendment to the Annual Salary Ordinance (Board of Supervisors File No. 102-92-14) as follows:

Fund	General Fund	
Department	Police	
Classification	Rate	Created
8238N Police Comm. Dispatcher	$1336B1619	7
8239N Sr. Police Comm. Dispatcher	1513B1835	3
	Total	10

Section 3. Although the City has incurred no legal obligation under the Charter, the Board of Supervisors does hereby appropriate the funds necessary for the obligation and does hereby ratify the action previously taken.

APPROVED AS TO FORM:
LOUISE H. RENNE, CITY ATTORNEY

BY: [signature]
DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY

FUNDS AVAILABLE:

[signature]
CONTROLLER

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

BY [signature]
GENERAL MANAGER, PERSONNEL

Supervisors Conroy, Alioto

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

DOCUMENTS DEPT
MAY 3 - 1993
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

Board of Supervisors, San Francisco

Passed for Second Reading	§	Finally Passed
	§	
April 5, 1993	§	April 12, 1993
	§	
	§	
Ayes: Supervisors Alioto Bierman	§	Ayes: Supervisors Alioto Bierman
Conroy Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman	§	Conroy Hallinan Kaufman Kennedy
Maher Migden Shelley	§	Maher Migden Shelley
	§	
Absent: Supervisors Achtenberg	§	Absent: Supervisors Achtenberg
Kennedy	§	Hsieh

I hereby certify that the foregoing ordinance was finally passed by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco

John L. Taylor
Clerk

File No.
101-92-51

APR 19 1993
Date Approved

Frank M. Jordan
Mayor

as amended in committee
3/31/93

FILE NO. 101-92-52 ORDINANCE NO. 105-93

(Government Funding) RO# 92157 SA# 45

CC

kg
3/31/933

APPROPRIATING $27,901 FOR PERMANENT SALARIES - MISCELLANEOUS AND RELATED MANDATORY FRINGE BENEFITS, POLICE DEPARTMENT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1992 - 93; ~~PROVIDING FOR RATIFICATION OF ACTION PREVIOUSLY TAKEN.~~

Be it ordained by the people of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. FUNDS ARE HEREBY APPROPRIATED FOR FY 1992-93 AS FOLLOWS:

Department and Number	Source of Funds and Purpose of Appropriation	Amount Debit	Amount Credit
01 - 001	**General Fund**		
G.L. 496 (000026)	Unappropriated Revenue Reserved		
Subsidiary 000006	General Reserve	$27,901	
38 - 00 - 00	Police Department		
01-0010 (580019)	Permanent Salaries - Miscellaneous		$20,363
04 - 0600	Mandatory Fringe Benefits		6,976
04 - 0703	Dental		562
	Total	**$27,901**	**$27,901**

kg
3/31/93

~~Section 2. Although the City has incurred no legal obligation under the Charter, the Board of Supervisors does hereby appropriate the funds necessary for the obligation and does hereby ratify the action previously taken.~~

APPROVED AS TO FORM:
LOUISE H. RENNE, CITY ATTORNEY

BY: [signature]
DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY

FUNDS AVAILABLE:

[signature]
CONTROLLER

SUPERVISORS MIGDEN, ALIOTO

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Board of Supervisors, San Francisco

Passed for Second Reading	Finally Passed
April 5, 1993	April 12, 1993
Ayes: Supervisors Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Maher Migden Shelley	Ayes: Supervisors Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Kaufman Kennedy Maher Migden Shelley
Absent: Supervisors Achtenberg Kennedy	Absent: Supervisors Achtenberg Hsieh

I hereby certify that the foregoing ordinance was finally passed by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco.

[signature]
Clerk

File No.
101-92-52

APR 19 1993
Date Approved

[signature]
Mayor

DOCUMENTS DEPT
MAY 3 - 1993
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

FILE NO. 101-92-54 ORDINANCE NO. 186-93

(Government Funding) RO# 92195 SA# 64

CC

APPROPRIATING $750,000 FOR MATERIALS AND SUPPLIES, SHERIFF DEPARTMENT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1992 - 93.

Be it ordained by the people of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. FUNDS ARE HEREBY APPROPRIATED FOR FY 1992-93 AS FOLLOWS:

Department and Number	Source of Funds and Purpose of Appropriation	Amount Debit	Amount Credit
01 - 001	General Fund		
G.L. 496 (000026)	Unappropriated Revenue Reserved		
Subsidiary 000006	General Reserve	$750,000	
06 - 00 - 00	Sheriff		
11-1300 (306589)	Materials and Supplies		$750,000

APPROVED AS TO FORM:
LOUISE H. RENNE, CITY ATTORNEY

BY: BGA
DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY

FUNDS AVAILABLE:

for CONTROLLER

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Board of Supervisors, San Francisco

Passed for Second Reading	§	Finally Passed
April 5, 1993	§	April 12, 1993
Ayes: Supervisors Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Maher Migden Shelley	§	Ayes: Supervisors Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Kaufman Kennedy Maher Migden Shelley
Absent: Supervisors Achtenberg Kennedy	§	Absent: Supervisors Achtenberg Hsieh

I hereby certify that the foregoing ordinance was finally passed by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco

Clerk

File No. 101-92-54

APR 19 1993
Date Approved

Mayor

DOCUMENTS DEPT.
MAY 3 - 1993
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

FILE NO. 101-92-55 as amended in committee 3/31/93 ORDINANCE NO. 107-93

(Government Funding) RO# 92138 SA# 8

kg 3/31/93 APPROPRIATING ~~$692,702~~ 690,864 FOR OVERTIME, SHERIFF DEPARTMENT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1992 - 93.

Be it ordained by the people of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. FUNDS ARE HEREBY APPROPRIATED FOR FY 1992-93 AS FOLLOWS:

Department and Number	Source of Funds and Purpose of Appropriation	Amount Debit	Amount Credit
01 - 001	General Fund		
99 - 00 - 00	General Fund Unallocated		
GL 496 (000026)	Unappropriated Revenue Reserved		
kg 3/31/93 Subsidiary 000006	General Reserve	~~$692,702~~ 690,864	
06 - 00 - 00	Sheriff		
03-0100 (306589)	Overtime		~~$692,702~~ 690,864

APPROVED AS TO FORM:
LOUISE H. RENNE, CITY ATTORNEY

BY: [signature]
DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY

FUNDS AVAILABLE:

[signature]
CONTROLLER

SUPERVISORS MIGDEN, ALIOTO

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

CC

Board of Supervisors, San Francisco

Passed for Second Reading	Finally Passed
April 5, 1993	April 12, 1993
Ayes: Supervisors Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Maher Migden Shelley	Ayes: Supervisors Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Kaufman Kennedy Maher Migden Shelley
Absent: Supervisors Achtenberg Kennedy	Absent: Supervisors Achtenberg Hsieh

I hereby certify that the foregoing ordinance was finally passed by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco

[signature]
Clerk

File No. 101-92-55

APR 19 1993
Date Approved

[signature]
Mayor

DOCUMENTS DEPT
MAY 3 - 1993
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

FILE NO. 97-93-12 ORDINANCE NO. 108-93

CC

[ESTABLISHMENT OF A REVOLVING FUND FOR REIMBURSABLE POLICE TRAVEL EXPENSES]

AMENDING CHAPTER 10 OF THE SAN FRANCISCO ADMINISTRATIVE CODE BY ADDING SECTION 10-169-9, THERETO, ESTABLISHING A REVOLVING FUND FOR REIMBURSABLE POLICE TRAVEL EXPENSES.

Note: The entire section is new.

Be it ordained by the people of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. The San Francisco Administrative Code is hereby amended by adding Section 10.169-9, thereof, to read as follows:

SEC. 10.169-9. POLICE DEPARTMENT TRAVEL EXPENSES REVOLVING FUND.

(a) Establishment of Revolving Fund. There is hereby established a revolving fund of Sixty Thousand ($60,000) Dollars to reimburse members of the Police Department for police-related travels.

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

LOUISE H. RENNE, CITY ATTORNEY

By: Theodore R. Lakey
DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY

SUPERVISOR ALIOTO
2689L/4

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Board of Supervisors, San Francisco

Passed for Second Reading	§	Finally Passed
April 5, 1993	§	April 12, 1993
Ayes: Supervisors Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Maher Migden Shelley	§	Ayes: Supervisors Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Kaufman Kennedy Maher Migden Shelley
Absent: Supervisors Achtenberg Kennedy	§	Absent: Supervisors Achtenberg Hsieh

I hereby certify that the foregoing ordinance was finally passed by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco

John L. Taylor
Clerk

File No.
97-93-12

APR 19 1993
Date Approved

Frank M. Jordan
Mayor

DOCUMENTS DEPT
MAY 3 - 1993
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

as amended in committee
3/31/93

FILE NO. 102-92-14 ORDINANCE NO. 109-93

PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT SAL.ORD.AMEND.NO. 11

kg 3/31/93

AMENDING ORDINANCE NO. 250-92 (ANNUAL SALARY ORDINANCE, 1992-93) REFLECTING THE ADDITION OF ~~SIXTEEN~~ TEN POSITIONS IN THE SAN FRANCISCO POLICE DEPARTMENT.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. The hereinafter designated section and items of Ordinance No. 250-92 (Annual Salary Ordinance, 1992-93) are hereby amended so that the same shall read as follows:

(Amendment)	No. Pos.	Class & Item No.	Class Title	Compensation Schedule
		Department:	38 Police Commission	
		Division:	00 Police	
		Section:	00 Police	
		Program:	0000 No Program Defined	
		Fund:	01001 General Fund	
		Index:	580019 SFPD-Commission and Chief's Off	
		Proj/Phase:	000/00 Unassigned Title	
		Object:	001 Permanent Salaries-Misc.	
7 ~~13~~ added	~~13~~ 7	8238 N	Police Communications Dispatcher.....	SC $1336B1618
3 added	3	8239 N	Sr. Police Communications Dispatcher..	SC 1513B1835

kg 3/31/93

APPROVED AS TO CLASSIFICATION:
CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

Earl S. Mason for
Albert C. Walker

APPROVED AS TO FORM:
LOUISE H. RENNE, CITY ATTORNEY

By: Theodore R. Lakey

No. 11

#6457C

Civil Service Commission
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

CC

Board of Supervisors, San Francisco

Passed for Second Reading	§	Finally Passed
April 5, 1993	§	April 12, 1993
Ayes: Supervisors Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Maher Migden Shelley	§	Ayes: Supervisors Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Kaufman Kennedy Maher Migden Shelley
Absent: Supervisors Achtenberg Kennedy	§	Absent: Supervisors Achtenberg Hsieh

I hereby certify that the foregoing ordinance was finally passed by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco

John Taylor
Clerk

File No. 102-92-14

APR 19 1993
Date Approved

Frank M. Jordan
Mayor

DOCUMENTS DEPT.
MAY 3 - 1993
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

FILE NO. 45-93-12

ORDINANCE NO. 110-93

RO #92182

CC

AUTHORIZATION SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION OF WILLIAM BESK, et al., v. CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, ET AL.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section I. The City Attorney is hereby authorized to settle the action entitled "WILLIAM BESK, et al., v. CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, et al.", United States District Court No. C91-3453 WHO, according to the terms and conditions of the attached Stipulation of Dismissal.

APPROVED AS TO FORM AND RECOMMENDED:

LOUISE H. RENNE
City Attorney

DENNIS AFTERGUT
Chief Assistant City Attorney

RECOMMENDED:

SAN FRANCISCO SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT

MICHAEL HENNESSEY, SHERIFF

FUNDS AVAILABLE

CONTROLLER

MAR 04 1993

3579G/81

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Board of Supervisors, San Francisco

Passed for Second Reading

April 12, 1993

Ayes: Supervisors Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Kaufman Kennedy Maher Migden Shelley

Absent: Supervisors Achtenberg Hsieh

Finally Passed

April 19, 1993

Ayes: Supervisors Achtenberg Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Kennedy Migden

Absent: Supervisors Maher Shelley

I hereby certify that the foregoing ordinance was finally passed by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco

Clerk

File No. 45-93-12

APR 29 1993

Date Approved

Mayor

DOCUMENTS DEPT.
MAY 17 1993
SAN FRANCISCO PUBLIC LIBRARY

FILE NO.: 45-93-13 ORDINANCE NO.: 111-93

RO #92187

CC

SETTLEMENT OF LAWSUIT]

AUTHORIZING SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION OF CEE DENT AGAINST THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO for $15,000.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section I. The City Attorney is hereby authorized to settle the action entitled "CEE DENT v. CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, et al.," Superior Court No. 937-833, by the payment of $15,000.

APPROVED AS TO FORM AND RECOMMENDED:

LOUISE H. RENNE
City Attorney

PATRICK J. MAHONEY
Chief Trial Deputy

RECOMMENDED:

SAN FRANCISCO POLICE DEPARTMENT

ANTHONY RIBERA
Chief of Police

FUNDS AVAILABLE:

EDWARD M. HARRINGTON
Controller

01 001 97 09 38
309781 1450 $15,000.00

MAR 10 1993

APPROVED:

SAN FRANCISCO POLICE COMMISSION

SECRETARY

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Board of Supervisors, San Francisco

Passed for Second Reading	Finally Passed
April 12, 1993	April 19, 1993
Ayes: Supervisors Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Kaufman Kennedy Maher Migden Shelley	Ayes: Supervisors Achtenberg Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Kennedy Migden
Absent: Supervisors Achtenberg Hsieh	Absent: Supervisors Maher Shelley

I hereby certify that the foregoing ordinance was finally passed by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco

Clerk

File No.
45-93-13

APR 29 1993

Date Approved

Mayor

DOCUMENTS DEPT.
MAY 17 1993
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

FILE NO. 45-93-14

ORDINANCE NO. 112-93

RO #92179

[SETTLEMENT OF LAWSUIT]

AUTHORIZING SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION OF JUDITH KEMPER AGAINST THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO for $8,500.00.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section I. The City Attorney is hereby authorized to settle the action entitled "JUDITH KEMPER v. CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, et al.," Municipal Court No. 077-348, by the payment of $8,500.00.

APPROVED AS TO FORM AND RECOMMENDED:

LOUISE H. RENNE
City Attorney

PATRICK J. MAHONEY
Chief Trial Deputy

RECOMMENDED:

JOSEPH MEDINA
Chief

FUNDS AVAILABLE:

EDWARD M. HARRINGTON
Controller

01 001 97 09 31
309773 1450 $8,500.00

MAR 04 1993

APPROVED:

SECRETARY
SAN FRANCISCO FIRE COMMISSSION

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

CC

Board of Supervisors, San Francisco

Passed for Second Reading	Finally Passed
April 12, 1993	April 19, 1993
Ayes: Supervisors Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Kaufman Kennedy Maher Migden Shelley	Ayes: Supervisors Achtenberg Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Kennedy Migden
Absent: Supervisors Achtenberg Hsieh	Absent: Supervisors Maher Shelley

I hereby certify that the foregoing ordinance was finally passed by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco

Clerk

File No.
45-93-14

APR 29 1993
Date Approved

Mayor

DOCUMENTS DEPT.
MAY 17 1993
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

FILE NO. 45-93-15

ORDINANCE NO. 113-93

RO #92197

[SETTLEMENT OF LAWSUIT]
AUTHORIZING SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION OF FRANCESCA MATARAZZO AND LUCREZIA CERAUDO AGAINST THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO FOR $15,500.00.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section I. The City Attorney is hereby authorized to settle the action entitled "FRANCESCA MATARAZZO & LUCREZIA CERAUDO V. THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, et al.," Superior Court No. 913-539, by the payment of $15,500.00.

APPROVED AS TO FORM
AND RECOMMENDED:

LOUISE H. RENNE
City Attorney

PATRICK J. MAHONEY
Chief Trial Deputy

FUNDS AVAILABLE:

EDWARD M. HARRINGTON
Controller

MAR 16 1993

01 001 97 09 38
309781 1450 $15,500.00

RECOMMENDED:

SAN FRANCISCO POLICE DEPARTMENT

ANTHONY RIBERA, Chief

APPROVED:

SAN FRANCISCO POLICE COMMISSION

Secretary

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

CC

Board of Supervisors, San Francisco

Passed for Second Reading	Finally Passed
April 12, 1993	April 19, 1993
Ayes: Supervisors Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Kaufman Kennedy Maher Migden Shelley	Ayes: Supervisors Achtenberg Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Kennedy Migden
Absent: Supervisors Achtenberg Hsieh	Absent: Supervisors Maher Shelley

I hereby certify that the foregoing ordinance was finally passed by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco

Clerk

File No.
45-93-15

APR 29 1993

Date Approved

Mayor

DOCUMENTS DEPT.
MAY 17 1993
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

FILE NO. 45-93-16

ORDINANCE NO. 114-93

RO #92196

CC

[SETTLEMENT OF LAWSUIT]

AUTHORIZING SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION OF JULIA MORGANTINI AGAINST THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO FOR $22,500.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section I. The City Attorney is hereby authorized to settle the action entitled "JULIA MORGANTINI v. MICHAEL FERRE, CHEVRON, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, et al.", Superior Court No. 940-711, by the payment of $22,500.

APPROVED AS TO FORM
AND RECOMMENDED:

LOUISE H. RENNE
City Attorney

PATRICK J. MAHONEY
Chief Trial Deputy

RECOMMENDED:

JOHN E. CRIBBS
Director, Department of Public Works

FUNDS AVAILABLE:

EDWARD M. HARRINGTON
Controller

MAR 16 1993

01 001 97 09 90
309674 1450 $22,500.00

APPROVED:

RUDOLF NOTHENBERG
Chief Administrative Officer

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Board of Supervisors, San Francisco

Passed for Second Reading	§	Finally Passed
April 12, 1993	§	April 19, 1993
Ayes: Supervisors Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Kaufman Kennedy Maher Migden Shelley	§	Ayes: Supervisors Achtenberg Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Kennedy Migden
Absent: Supervisors Achtenberg Hsieh	§	Absent: Supervisors Maher Shelley

I hereby certify that the foregoing ordinance was finally passed by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco

Clerk

File No.
45-93-16

APR 29 1993

Date Approved

Mayor

DOCUMENTS DEPT
MAY 17 1993
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

FILE NO. 45-93-17

ORDINANCE NO. 115-93

RO #92202

CC

[SETTLEMENT OF LAWSUIT]
AUTHORIZING SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION OF JOSHU LUCAS AGAINST THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO FOR $20,000.00.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. The City Attorney is hereby authorized to settle the action entitled "JOSHU LUCAS V. THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, et al.," Superior Court No. 940-395, by the payment of $20,000.00.

APPROVED AS TO FORM AND RECOMMENDED:

LOUISE H. RENNE
City Attorney

PATRICK J. MAHONEY
Chief Trial Deputy

RECOMMENDED:

PUBLIC HEALTH DEPARTMENT

RAYMOND J. BAXTER, Director

FUNDS AVAILABLE:

EDWARD M. HARRINGTON
Controller

MAR 24 1993

01 001 97 09 86
309807 1450 $20,000.00

APPROVED:

PUBLIC HEALTH COMMISSION:

SECRETARY

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Board of Supervisors, San Francisco

Passed for Second Reading	Finally Passed
April 12, 1993	April 19, 1993
Ayes: Supervisors Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Kaufman Kennedy Maher Migden Shelley	Ayes: Supervisors Achtenberg Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Kennedy Migden
Absent: Supervisors Achtenberg Hsieh	Absent: Supervisors Maher Shelley

I hereby certify that the foregoing ordinance was finally passed by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco

Clerk

File No.
45-93-17

APR 29 1993

Date Approved

Mayor

DOCUMENTS DEPT
MAY 17 1993
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

As Amended in Committee
4/14/93

FILE NO. 101-92-59

ORDINANCE NO. 116-93

(Government Funding)

RO# 92178 SA# 77 & 78

kg
4/14/93

APPROPRIATING $2,440,000 FOR VARIOUS CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS, PORT COMMISSION FOR FISCAL YEAR 1992 - 93; placing $2,440,000 on reserve.

Be it ordained by the people of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. FUNDS ARE HEREBY APPROPRIATED FOR FY 1992-93 AS FOLLOWS:

Department and Number	Source of Funds and Purpose of Appropriation	Amount Debit	Amount Credit
34 - 001	**San Francisco Harbor Operating Fund**		
39 - 00 - 00	**Port Commission**		
GL 490 (026013)	Unappropriated Revenue	$1,300,000	
Project 628-01	Starporter Crane		
20-2030 (590042)	Capital Improvement Project		$1,300,000
	Total - SF Operating Fund	**$1,300,000**	**$1,300,000**
34 - 505	**Fire Insurance Proceeds Fund**		
39 - 90 - 01	**Port Commission**		
GL 301 (004788)	Unreserved Fund Balance	$1,140,000	
Project 605-01	Lead Contaminated Materials		
20-2030 (590059)	Capital Improvement Project		$140,000
Project 607-01	Starporter Crane		
20-2030 (590059)	Capital Improvement Project		1,000,000
	Total - Fire Insurance Proceeds Fund	**$1,140,000**	**$1,140,000**
	Grand Total	**$2,440,000**	**$2,440,000**

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

kg
4/14/93

Section 2. Funds in the amount of $2,440,000 (for capital improvement projects) are hereby placed on reserve pending selection of the contractors and the MBE/WBE status of the contractors.

APPROVED AS TO FORM:
LOUISE H. RENNE, CITY ATTORNEY

BY: [signature]
DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY

FUNDS AVAILABLE:

[signature]
CONTROLLER

Board of Supervisors, San Francisco

Passed for Second Reading

April 19, 1993

Ayes: Supervisors Achtenberg Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Kennedy Maher Migden Shelley

Finally Passed

April 26, 1993

Ayes: Supervisors Alioto Bierman Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Kennedy Maher Migden Shelley

Absent: Supervisors Achtenberg Conroy

I hereby certify that the foregoing ordinance was finally passed by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco

[signature]
Clerk

File No.
101-92-59

APR 30 1993
Date Approved

[signature]
Mayor

DOCUMENTS DEPT
MAY 17 1993
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

FILE NO. 101-92-61
(Government Funding)

ORDINANCE NO. 117-93
RO# 92193 SA# 71 & 72

APPROPRIATING $71,327 FOR PROFESSIONAL SERVICES AND SERVICES OF OTHER DEPARTMENTS - MISCELLANEOUS DEPARTMENTS, BOARD OF SUPERVISORS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1992 - 93; SUBJECT OF PREVIOUS BUDGETARY DENIAL.

Be it ordained by the people of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. FUNDS ARE HEREBY APPROPRIATED FOR FY 1992-93 AS FOLLOWS:

Department and Number	Source of Funds and Purpose of Appropriation	Amount Debit	Amount Credit
01 - 001	**General Fund**		
01 - 00 - 00	**Board of Supervisors**		
99-9990 (235002)	Revenue Transfer In From # 02-006, Cable TV Access Development & Program Fund	$30,802	
10-1001 (300012)	Professional Services		$30,802
	Total - General Fund	**$30,802**	**$30,802**
02 - 006	**Cable TV Access Development & Program Fund**		
GL 490 (019505)	Unappropriated Revenue	$71,327	
49-4900 (915504)	Revenue Transfer Out to # 01-001, General Fund Unallocated		$30,802
30-3450 (300186)	Services of Other Departments - Mayor's Office Services		40,525
	Total - Cable TV Access Fund	**$71,327**	**$71,327**

Section 2. This Ordinance is adopted by a two - thirds vote of all members of the Board of Supervisors pursuant to Section 6.306 of the Charter. These items were previously requested by Budget Estimate and denied by the Board of Supervisors.

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

APPROVED AS TO FORM:
LOUISE H. RENNE, CITY ATTORNEY

BY: [signature]
DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY

FUNDS AVAILABLE:

[signature]
CONTROLLER

Board of Supervisors, San Francisco

Passed for Second Reading

April 19, 1993

Ayes: Supervisors Achtenberg Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Kennedy Maher Migden Shelley

Finally Passed

April 26, 1993

Ayes: Supervisors Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Kennedy Maher Migden Shelley

Absent: Supervisor Achtenberg

I hereby certify that the foregoing ordinance was finally passed by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco

[signature]
Clerk

File No. 101-92-61

APR 30 1993
Date Approved

[signature]
Mayor

DOCUMENTS DEPT
MAY 17 1993
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

FILE NO. 101-92-57 as amended 4/7/93 ORDINANCE NO. 118-93

(Government Funding) RO# 92200 SA# 89

kg 4/7/93

APPROPRIATING $500,000 FOR PROGRAM PROJECT BUDGET (FIRE BENEFIT ASSESSMENT DISTRICT PROJECT) ;PLACING ~~$60,042 ON RESERVE, CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER FOR FISCAL YEAR 1992-93~~ $350,000 on reserve, Chief Administrative Officer for Fiscal Year 1992-93.

Be it ordained by the people of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. FUNDS ARE HEREBY APPROPRIATED FOR FY 1992-93 AS FOLLOWS:

Department and Number	Source of Funds and Purpose of Appropriation	Amount Debit	Amount Credit
01 - 001	**General Fund**		
99 - 00 - 00	**General Fund Unallocated**		
GL 496 (000026)	Unappropriated Revenue Reserved		
Subsidiary 000006	General Reserve	$500,000	
70 - 01 - 00	Chief Administrative Officer		
Project	Fire Benefit Assessment District Project		
20-2010 ( )	Program Project Budget		$500,000

kg 4/7

Section 2. ~~Funds in the amount of $60,042 for contingency funds are hereby placed on reserve until released by the Finance Committee.~~ Funds in the amount of $350,000 are hereby placed on reserve until released by the Budget Committee.

APPROVED AS TO FORM:
LOUISE H. RENNE, CITY ATTORNEY

BY: _____
DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY

FUNDS AVAILABLE:

_____
CONTROLLER

SUPERVISORS MIGDEN, ALIOTO

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Board of Supervisors, San Francisco

Passed for Second Reading	Finally Passed
April 12, 1993	April 19, 1993
Ayes: Supervisors Achtenberg Alioto Bierman Hallinan Kaufman Kennedy Migden Shelley	Ayes: Supervisors Achtenberg Alioto Bierman Hallinan Kaufman Kennedy Migden
Noes: Supervisors Conroy Hsieh Maher	Noes: Supervisors Conroy Hsieh
	Absent: Supervisors Maher Shelley

I hereby certify that the foregoing ordinance was finally passed by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco

John L. Taylor
Clerk

APR 29 1993
Date Approved

File No.
101-92-57

Frank M. Jordan
Mayor

DOCUMENTS DEPT
MAY 17 1993
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

As amended in committee
4/7/93

FILE NO. 101-92-58 ORDINANCE NO. 119-93

(Government Funding) RO# 92203 SA# 93

APPROPRIATING $590,407 FOR PERMANENT SALARIES, MANDATORY FRINGE BENEFITS, MATERIALS AND SUPPLIES, EQUIPMENT PURCHASE - COMMUNICATIONS, DATA PROCESSING - WORD PROCESSING EQUIPMENT AND SERVICES OF OTHER DEPARTMENTS - BUILDING REPAIR, FOR THE CREATION OF THIRTY (30) POSITIONS, SHERIFF DEPARTMENT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1992 -93.

Be it ordained by the people of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. FUNDS ARE HEREBY APPROPRIATED FOR FY 1992-93 AS FOLLOWS:

Department and Number	Source of Funds and Purpose of Appropriation	Amount Debit	Amount Credit
01 - 001	**General Fund**		
99 - 00 - 00	General Fund Unappropriated		
GL 491 (000026)	Unappropriated Revenue Reserved		
Subsidiary 000061	Litigation Reserve	$590,407	
06 - 00 - 00	Sheriff		
Project 038 - 01	San Bruno Project - Besk Case		
01 - 0010 (305029)	Permanent Salaries		$190,460
04-0600	Mandatory Fringe Benefits		17,184 ~~15,774~~
10-1274	Training		199,636
11-1300	Materials and Supplies		63,927
22-2220	Communications		58,000
23-2310	Data Processing Word Processing Equipment		3,200
30-3180	Services of Other Departments - Building Repair		58,000
	TOTAL	$590,407	$590,407

kg 4/7

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Section 2. Funds are hereby appropriated for thirty (30) positions created by amendment to the Annual Salary Ordinance (Board of Supervisors File No. 102-92-19) as follows:

Fund	General Fund	
Department	Sheriff	
Classification	Rate	Created
8304L Deputy Sheriff	1429B1731	29
8274L Police Cadet	822B822	1
	Total	30

APPROVED AS TO FORM:
LOUISE H. RENNE, CITY ATTORNEY

BY: _____
DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY

FUNDS AVAILABLE:

_____ for
CONTROLLER

APPROVED:
CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

BY: _____ for
GENERAL MANAGER, PERSONNEL

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

DOCUMENTS DEPT.
MAY 17 1993
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

CC

Board of Supervisors, San Francisco

Passed for Second Reading	§	Finally Passed
	§	
April 12, 1993	§	April 19, 1993
	§	
	§	
Ayes: Supervisors Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Kaufman Kennedy Maher Migden Shelley	§	Ayes: Supervisors Achtenberg Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Kennedy Migden
	§	
Absent: Supervisors Achtenberg Hsieh	§	Absent: Supervisors Maher Shelley
	§	

I hereby certify that the foregoing ordinance was finally passed by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco

John L. Taylor
Clerk

APR 29 1993
Date Approved

Frank M. Jordan
Mayor

File No.
101-92-58

FILE NO. 102-92-19 ORDINANCE NO. 120-93

CC

PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT SAL.ORD.AMEND.NO. 14

AMENDING ORDINANCE NO. 250-92 (ANNUAL SALARY ORDINANCE, 1992-93) REFLECTING THE ADDITION OF THIRTY POSITIONS IN THE SHERIFF'S OFFICE.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. The hereinafter designated section and items of Ordinance No. 250-92 (Annual Salary Ordinance, 1992-93) are hereby amended so that the same shall read as follows:

(Amend-ment)	No. Pos.	Class & Item No.	Class Title	Compensation Schedule
		Department:	06 Sheriff	
		Division:	00 Sheriff	
		Section:	00 Sheriff	
		Program:	1606 Sheriff Project Expenditure	
		Fund:	01001 General Fund	
		Index:	305029 Sheriff Project Expenditure	
		Proj/Phase:	038/01 San Bruno Project-BESK CASE	
		Object:	001 Permanent Salaries-Misc.	
29 added	29	8304 L	Deputy Sheriff.....	SC $1429B1731
1 added	1	8274 L	Police Cadet.....	SC 822B822

APPROVED AS TO CLASSIFICATION:
CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

GENERAL MANAGER, PERSONNEL

#6543C

Civil Service Commission
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

APPROVED AS TO FORM:
LOUISE H. RENNE, CITY ATTORNEY

By: Theodore P. Lakey
DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY

No. 14

Board of Supervisors, San Francisco

Passed for Second Reading

April 12, 1993

Ayes: Supervisors Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Kaufman Kennedy Maher Migden Shelley

Absent: Supervisors Achtenberg Hsieh

Finally Passed

April 19, 1993

Ayes: Supervisors Achtenberg Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Kennedy Migden

Absent: Supervisors Maher Shelley

I hereby certify that the foregoing ordinance was finally passed by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco

John L. Taylor
Clerk

File No. 102-92-19

APR 29 1993
Date Approved

Mayor

DOCUMENTS DEPT.
MAY 17 1993
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

FILE NO. 34-93-2

ORDINANCE NO. 121-93

AMENDING ORDINANCE NO. 1061 ENTITLED "REGULATING THE WIDTH OF SIDEWALKS" BY ADDING THERETO SECTIONS 1509 CHANGING THE OFFICIAL WIDTH OF SIDEWALK ON THE SOUTH SIDE OF MISSION STREET AS SHOWN ON THE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS MAP NUMBERED Q-20-388 AND MAKING FINDINGS PURSUANT TO CITY PLANNING CODE SECTION 101.1.

Be it ordained by the people of the City and County of San Francisco:

SECTION 1. Ordinance No. 1061 entitled "Regulating the Width of Sidewalk", be and is hereby amended in accordance with communication filed in the office of the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors, by adding thereto a new section to be numbered as follows:

Section 1509. The width of sidewalk on the south side of Mission Street between 3rd Street and 4th Street, as shown on Department of Public Works Map Q-20-388.

SECTION 2. The Department of City Planning in its report dated June 24, 1992, declared that the above-described change of official sidewalk width is in conformity with the Master Plan, and made findings of consistency with the Eight Priority Policies of City Planning Code Section 101.1.

The San Francisco Board of Supervisors adopts as its own and incorporates by reference herein as though fully set forth in findings made by the Department of City Planning, by its letter dated June 24, 1992, that the project intended by the proposed change of official sidewalk width is consistent with the Eight Priority Policies of City Planning Code Section 101.1.

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

The Department of Public Works, as is necessary as a result of this Ordinance, shall make arrangement with public utility companies and City departments for the relocation and/or adjustment of their facilities in the affected sidewalk and street area.

RECOMMENDED:

Director of Public Works

DESCRIPTION APPROVED:

Deputy Director, Public Services

APPROVED:

Chief Administrative Officer

APPROVED AS TO FORM:
LOUISE RENNE, CITY ATTORNEY

By

Deputy City Attorney

Board of Supervisors, San Francisco

Passed for Second Reading	Finally Passed
April 12, 1993	April 19, 1993
Ayes: Supervisors Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Kaufman Kennedy Maher Migden Shelley	Ayes: Supervisors Achtenberg Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Kennedy Migden
Absent: Supervisors Achtenberg Hsieh	Absent: Supervisors Maher Shelley

I hereby certify that the foregoing ordinance was finally passed by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco

Clerk

File No.
34-93-2

APR 29 1993

Date Approved

Mayor

DOCUMENTS DEPT.
MAY 17 1993
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

(Union Square and Fisherman's Wharf Sightseeing Bus Stands)

AMENDING THE SAN FRANCISCO POLICE CODE BY AMENDING ARTICLE 16 (REGULATIONS FOR MOTOR VEHICLES FOR HIRE), DIVISION IV (SIGHTSEEING AND INTERURBAN BUSSES), SECTION 1159 THEREOF TO (1) PLACE THE ISSUANCE OF PERMITS FOR THE UNION SQUARE AND FISHERMAN'S WHARF SIGHTSEEING VEHICLE STANDS UNDER THE JURISDICTION OF THE DEPARTMENT OF PARKING AND TRAFFIC; (2) TO PROVIDE FOR A COMPETITIVE BIDDING PROCEDURE FOR THE ISSUANCE OF THE UNION SQUARE PERMIT; AND (3) TO MAKE MISCELLANEOUS AMENDMENTS TO THE CRITERIA USED IN ISSUING THE UNION SQUARE PERMIT.

Note: Additions or substitutions are underlined; deletions are indicated by ((double parentheses)).

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. Division IV, Article 16 of the San Francisco Police is hereby amended by amending Section 1159 thereof to read as follows:

SEC. 1159. **UNION SQUARE AND FISHERMAN'S WHARF SIGHTSEEING VEHICLE ((BUS)) STANDS.** (a) **Union Square Stand.** The Department of Parking and Traffic ((Public Works)) shall issue to a single person or entity a permit for a sightseeing vehicle to stand on the east side of Powell Street, between Geary and Post Streets,

for the purpose of selling tickets for sightseeing tours and for the other purposes as described in this Section. A vehicle owned by the permittee may pick up and discharge sightseeing passengers from the Powell Street curb in front of the vehicle ticket stand an average of not more than two times each hour, provided that such vehicle does not spend more than 10 minutes at the curb in each instance.

(b) **Permit Required.** None of the vehicles mentioned in this Section shall stand on the streets mentioned herein unless the permit from the Department of Parking and Traffic ((Public Works)) has been first obtained. Not more than one permit shall be issued to any person, firm, corporation or association for more than one vehicle at any one time.

(c) **Terms of Permit.** The permit referred to in Subsections (a) and (b) above shall have a term of five years, and shall be competitively rebid every five years by the Department of Parking and Traffic ((Public Works)) in order to ensure that the fee for such permit reflects the fair market value for such permit and that the service to the touring public and to the City is adequate. ((, and in order to give other sightseeing tour operators the opportunity to bid on the permit by demonstrating to the Department of Public Works that they can provide better service to the touring public and to the City. Not less than six months prior to the expiration date of the permit, the Director of Public Works shall solicit bids to operate the sightseeing

DOCUMENTS DEPT.
MAY 17 1993
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

ticket stand at Union Square in compliance with this ordinance. The Department of Public Works shall conduct a hearing to consider such bids and at such hearing each person making a proposal shall have an opportunity to present its proposal to the Department. Each time the sightseeing bus permit is issued, the successful permittee shall pay a permit fee of $5,000.)) The Department of Parking and Traffic ((Public Works)) may revoke the permit at any time if it finds, after notice and hearing, that the permittee ((consistently)) is in material violation of ((this Section)) the conditions of the permit as specified in this Section and a written agreement between the Department and the permittee. The Department of Parking and Traffic ((Public Works)) shall base its decision to award the permit upon specific applicable criteria developed and published by the Department ((of Public Works)), after a public comment period of not less than 30 days, which shall include, but not be limited to, the factors set forth below.

(1) Whether the financial, equipment, and personnel resources, and the financial responsibility, of the proposed permittee are such that it will likely be able to conduct its proposed sightseeing tour operation during the term of the permit and otherwise fulfill its obligations under this Section;

GJ 3/23 (2) Whether the proposed permittee's duration and breadth of experience in the sightseeing tour business in San Francisco is sufficient;

GJ 3/23 (((3) Whether the proposed vehicle ticket stand, ticket sales operation, and sightseeing tour operation is aesthetically consistent with the Union Square ambience and atmosphere and will best serve the City and the touring public;))

GJ 3/23 (4)))(3) Whether a "prevailing wage" as that term is defined in Section 6.1-3 of Chapter 6 of the San Francisco Administrative Code has been or will be paid to employees of the proposed permittee or its independent contractors, and whether the various terms and conditions of employment required by law have and will be observed;

GJ 3/23 (((5)))(4) Whether the amount of public liability and vehicle insurance coverage carried by the proposed permittee is reasonable;

GJ 3/23 (((6)))(5) Whether a Public Utilities Commission sightseeing or other appropriate permit or certificate granting authority to operate sightseeing and/or charter tours has been obtained;

GJ 3/23 (((7)))(6) Whether the proposed permittee has a record of timely and comprehensive tour service to the public;

GJ 3/23 (((8)))(7) In the case of an existing permittee, whether the permittee's record of performance of its obligations under this Section is satisfactory.

(d) The successful permittee shall conduct its sightseeing tour operation substantially ((as described in its proposal to the Department of Public Works)) in accordance with the terms and

conditions of a written agreement developed by the Department of Parking and Traffic in accordance with this Section. The permittee shall offer and display to the public free of charge at the ticket stand a brochure containing information about the history of San Francisco and Union Square. The permittee shall staff the ticket stand with at least one person knowledgeable about the history of San Francisco and Union Square, not less than 10 hours per day, seven days per week, and shall provide sightseeing tours to the public each day of the year including holidays. At all times during the term of the permit, the permittee shall carry general public liability and vehicle insurance in amounts not less than those required by the Department of Parking and Traffic in its reasonable discretion, but in no event less than the amounts required to be carried by holders of sightseeing permits granted by the California Public Utilities Commission. ((In addition, the permittee shall comply with all rules and regulations relating to inspection, maintenance, etc. program submitted by the permittee and approved by the Department of Public Works.))

(e) **Fisherman's Wharf Stand.** The Department of Parking and Traffic ((Public Works)) may issue permits for sightseeing vehicles ((buses)) to stand on the north side of Beach Street between Leavenworth and Jones Streets, and the ease and west side of Leavenworth Street between Beach and Jefferson Streets. Sightseeing tour vehicles shall not stand on the streets

mentioned herein unless the permit from the Department of Parking and Traffic ((Public Works)) has first been obtained. The Department of Parking and Traffic ((Public Works)) shall establish ((a)) fees for such permits based upon the estimated cost of administering the permit process.

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

LOUISE H. RENNE
City Attorney

By: Larry Wayte
LAWRENCE A. WAYTE
Deputy City Attorney

Board of Supervisors, San Francisco

Passed for Second Reading	§	Finally Passed
April 12, 1993	§	April 19, 1993
Ayes: Supervisors Achtenberg Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Kennedy Maher Migden Shelley	§	Ayes: Supervisors Achtenberg Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Kennedy Migden
	§	Absent: Supervisors Maher Shelley

I hereby certify that the foregoing ordinance was finally passed by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco

John Taylor
Clerk

File No.
121-93-1

APR 29 1993
Date Approved

Frank M. Jordan
Mayor

FILE NO. 179-93-1 ORDINANCE NO. 123-93

(Prohibition Against Restriction On Number of Occupants)

AMENDING THE SAN FRANCISCO MUNICIPAL CODE PART II, CHAPTER XII, (HOUSING CODE), BY AMENDING CHAPTER 5, SECTION 503 TO PROHIBIT ANY PERSONS OR THEIR AGENTS FROM REFUSING A DWELLING UNIT ON THE BASIS OF THE NUMBER OF OCCUPANTS IF THE NUMBER OF PERSONS OCCUPYING A ROOM FOR SLEEPING PURPOSES DOES NOT VIOLATE THE MINIMUM SUPERFICIAL FLOOR AREA STANDARDS PRESCRIBED IN SECTION 503(b), AND BY AMENDING SECTION 204 TO PROVIDE FOR CIVIL REMEDIES; AMENDING THE SAN FRANCISCO MUNICIPAL CODE (POLICE CODE) PART II, CHARTER VIII, BY AMENDING SECTION 102 TO REPEAL SECTION 102(g).

Note: Additions are indicated by <u>underlining</u>; deletions are indicated by ((double parentheses)).

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. <u>Findings</u>. The Board of Supervisors hereby finds:

1. Pursuant to California Health and Safety Code Section 17958.5, the Board of Supervisors hereby adopts this statement of local conditions warranting an amendment to the Housing Code. Although this legislation making it illegal to refuse a dwelling unit on the number of occupants is an amendment to the Housing Code, the amendment does not alter any of the standards of the State Housing Code (Title 24 California Code of Regulations).

//

2. San Francisco is a highly urbanized and developed city with limited land resources, covering an area of 30,500 acres. Less than 2 percent of the City's land area remains as housing opportunity development sites.

3. The demand for family housing in San Francisco increased substantially in the 1980's as more households reached child bearing age and as more families migrated to the City. Families compete for the City's limited supply of new and existing family housing. While demand for family housing increased, the amount of construction of family housing averaged only about two hundred units per year.

4. In addition, the number of persons per household has increased.

5. The increase in the number of large family households is expected to continue in the 1990's, with a projected growth of 40% new family households.

6. This amendment to the Housing Code is necessary to provide greater access to housing in San Francisco for families.

Section 2. The San Francisco Municipal Code Part II, Chapter XII, (Housing Code) is hereby amended by amending Article 5, Section 503 thereof, to read as follows:

Sec. 503. ROOM DIMENSIONS. (a) Ceiling Heights. Unless legally constructed as such, no habitable room shall have a ceiling height less than seven feet six inches. Any room, other

//

DOCUMENTS DEPT
MAY 17 1993
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

than a habitable room, shall have a ceiling height of not less than seven feet.

(b) Superficial Floor Area. Every dwelling unit shall have at least one room which shall have not less than 120 square feet of superficial floor area. Every room which is used for both cooking and living or both living and sleeping purposes shall have not less than 144 square feet of superficial floor area. Every room used for sleeping purposes shall have not less than 70 square feet of superficial floor area. When more than two persons occupy a room used for sleeping purposes the required superficial floor area shall be increased at the rate of 50 square feet for each occupant in excess of two. Guest rooms with cooking shall contain the combined required superficial areas of a sleeping room and a kitchen, but not less than 144 square feet.

Notwithstanding any provision of this section, children under the age of six shall not be counted for purposes of determining whether a family with minor children complies with the provisions of the Code.

(c) Width. No habitable room except a kitchen shall be less than seven feet in width. Rooms used as guest rooms with cooking shall have a 10-foot minimum width.

(d) Housing Access. To promote access to housing by families, it shall be unlawful for the owner, lessor, lessee, sublessee, real estate broker, assignee, or other person having the rights of ownership, the right of possession, or the right to

rent or lease any dwelling unit or any agent or employee of such person to refuse to rent or lease, or otherwise deny, a dwelling unit to a family, as defined in Section 401 of this Code, on the basis of the actual or potential number of occupants if the total number of persons occupying a room for sleeping purposes does not violate the minimum superficial floor area standards prescribed in subsection (b) of this section.

(e) Remedies. A violation of subsection (d) of this section shall be subject to the civil remedies specified in Section 204 (e) of this Code.

Section 3. The San Francisco Municipal Code Part II, Chapter XII, (Housing Code) is hereby amended by amending Article 5, Section 204 thereof, to read as follows:

SEC. 204. VIOLATIONS. (a) Penalty for Violation. Any person, the owner or their authorized agent who violates, disobeys, omits, neglects or refuses to comply with, or who resists or opposes the execution of any of the provisions of this Code, or any order of the Superintendent or the Director of Public Works, made pursuant to this Code, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine not exceeding $500, or by imprisonment not exceeding six months, or by both such fine and imprisonment, and shall be deemed guilty of a separate offense for every day such violation, disobedience, omission, neglect or refusal shall continue. Any person who shall do any work in violation of any of the

provisions of this Code, or any order of the Superintendent or the Director of Public Works made pursuant to this Code, and any person having charge of such work who shall permit it to be done, shall be liable to the penalty provided.

(b) Department Members as Public Officers. In the performance of their duties, Housing Inspectors, Senior Housing Inspector, or any other representatives of the Superintendent who have the duty to enforce violations of Sections 7.01(a), (b) or (c) of this Code shall have the power, authority and immunity of a public officer and employee as set forth in California Penal Code Section 836.5, to make arrests without a warrant whenever such employees have reasonable cause to believe that the person to be arrested has committed a misdemeanor in their presence which is a violation of Sections 701(a), (b) or (c) of this Code. In any case in which a person is arrested pursuant to this authority and the person arrested does not demand to be taken before a magistrate, the public officer or employee making the arrest shall prepare a written notice to appear and shall release the person on their promise to appear as prescribed by Chapter 5C (commencing with Section 853.6) of the California Penal Code.

(c) Criminal Penalties for Violation of Section 701(a), (b) or (c). Any person or entity violating Sections 701(a), (b) or (c) of this Code shall be guilty of an infraction or a misdemeanor and the complaint charging such violation shall

//

specify whether the violation charged is a misdemeanor or an infraction.

If charged as an infraction, the penalty upon conviction thereof shall be not less than $100 or more than $500, no part of which may be suspended.

If charged as a misdemeanor, the penalty upon conviction thereof shall be a fine of not less than $500 or more than $1000 or imprisonment in the county jail not exceeding six months, or both such fine and imprisonment, no part of which may be suspended.

Every day such violation shall continue shall be considered as a new offense. There shall be no more than one violation per building per day.

For purposes of Sections 204(a) and (b), a violation of Sections 701(a), (b) or (c) shall include, but is not limited to, disobedience, omission, failure or refusal to comply with any requirement imposed by Sections 701(a), (b) or (c) or with any notice or order of the Superintendent or the Director of Public Works regarding a violation of Sections 701(a), (b) or (c).

(d) Presumption of Noncompliance with Order; Civil Penalty for Violation of Sections 701(a) (b) or (c).

(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Code, any person or entity served, in any manner permitted for service of process under the provision of the Code of Civil Procedure, with a notice or order by the Superintendent or the Director of Public

Works setting forth the nature of the violation of Sections 701(a), (b) or (c) of the Housing Code, demanding correction of such violation, and specifying the time within which such violation must be corrected, shall be presumed, in civil proceedings, to have failed to comply with said notice or order at and after the time given in said notice or order for correction of such violation has expired without correction of said violation.

(2) Any person or entity violating Sections 701(a), (b) or (c) shall be liable for a civil penalty of not less than $500 for each day such violation is committed or permitted to continue, which penalty shall be assessed and recovered in a civil action brought in the name of the people of the City and County of San Francisco by the City Attorney in any court of competent jurisdiction. There shall be no more than one violation per building per day. Any penalty assessed and recovered in an action brought pursuant to this paragraph shall be paid to the Treasurer of the City and County of San Francisco.

(3) The remedies in this Section are in addition to any other remedies provided by law.

(e) Civil Remedies for Violation of Section 503(d). In addition to the penalties specified in subsection (a) of this Section, Section 503(d) of this Code may also be enforced by a civil action authorized under this subsection.

//

(1) Any aggrieved person may enforce Section 503(d) of this Code by means of a civil action.

(2) Any person who violates Section 503(d) of this Code or who aids in the violation of Section 503(d) of this Code shall be liable for three times the amount of special and general damages, or three times the amount of one month's rent that the landlord charges for the unit in question. The court may award in addition thereto, not less than $200 but not more than $400, together with punitive damages. The interested party instituting a civil proceeding, or the City suing to enforce Section 503(d), if prevailing parties, shall be entitled to the costs of enforcing Section 503(d), including reasonable attorney's fees, pursuant to a court order.

(3) Any person who commits, or proposes to commit, an action in violation of Section 503(d) may be enjoined therefrom by any court of competent jurisdiction.

(4) Any action under this subsection may be brought by any aggrieved person, by the District Attorney, by the City Attorney, or by any interested party on behalf of the aggrieved person.

(5) Any action brought under this subsection shall be filed within one year of the alleged violation.

Section 4. The San Francisco Municipal Code Part II, Chapter 8 (Police Code) is hereby amended by amending Section 102 thereof to read as follows:

SECTION 102. PROHIBITED ACTIVITY. It shall be unlawful for the owner, lessor, lessee, sublessee, real estate broker, assignee, or other person having the rights of ownership, the right of possession, or the right to rent or lease any housing accommodations, or any agent or employee of such person to:

(a) Refuse to rent or lease, or otherwise deny to or withhold from any person such accommodations because such person has a minor child or children who shall occupy the leased or rented premises with such person;

(b) Represent to any person because of the potential tenancy of a minor child or children that housing accommodations are not available for inspection or rental when such dwelling is in fact so available;

(c) Make, print, or publish, or cause to be made, printed or published any notice, statement, or advertisement, with respect to the rental of housing accommodations that indicates any preference, limitation, or discrimination based on the potential tenancy of a minor child or children;

(d) Discriminate against any person in the terms, conditions or privileges of the rental of housing accommodations or in the provision of services or facilities in connection therewith, because of the potential tenancy of a minor child or children;

(e) Refuse to rent after the making of a bona fide offer, or to refuse to negotiate for the rental of, or otherwise make

unavailable or deny, housing accommodations to any person because of the potential tenancy of a minor child or children;

(f) Include in any lease or rental agreement of housing accommodations a clause providing that as a condition of continued tenancy the tenants shall remain childless or shall not bear children.

(((g) Refuse to rent or lease, or otherwise deny, housing accommodations on the basis of the actual or potential number of occupants if the total number of persons does not exceed the occupancy standards set forth in Section 501.1 of Article 5 of the San Francisco Housing Code;))

g (((h))) Charge additional rent, deposits, fees, or surcharges on the basis of actual or potential number or age of persons living in the housing accommodations;

h (((i))) Establish unreasonable rules for, or conditions of, occupancy of housing accommodations which have the effect of excluding or discriminating against persons with children. Examples of unreasonable rules include, but are not limited to, the following:

(1) Restricting the hours during which minor children but not adults may use recreational facilities on the property;

(2) Requiring that minor children who are six years of age or older be accompanied by a parent or other adult when using common areas which are accessible to all tenants and which do not present any unusual hazards;

(3) Limiting the occupancy of persons with children to certain units, floors or areas of an apartment building; and

(4) Prohibiting children of the opposite sex from sharing the same bedroom. Nothing in this subsection shall preclude a property owner or other person having the right to rent or lease any housing accommodations from adopting reasonable policies or practices regulating the use of the accommodations or its common areas, facilities, and services even though those policies and practices have the effect of excluding persons with children. A policy or practice is reasonable, under this subsection, if it fulfills a business necessity. Business necessity is demonstrated by independent and objective evidence that the policy or practice in question serves a legitimate and nondiscriminatory business purpose and is essential to the safe and continued operation of the business.

Section 5. Severability. If any part or provision of this Ordinance, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance, is held invalid, the remainder of the Ordinance, including the application of such part or provision to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby and shall continue in full force and effect. To this end, provisions of this Ordinance are severable.

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

LOUISE H. RENNE
City Attorney

Deputy City Attorney

Board of Supervisors, San Francisco

Passed for Second Reading	§	Finally Passed
April 12, 1993	§	April 19, 1993
Ayes: Supervisors Achtenberg Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Kennedy Maher Migden Shelley	§	Ayes: Supervisors Achtenberg Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Kennedy Migden
	§	Absent: Supervisors Maher Shelley

I hereby certify that the foregoing ordinance was finally passed by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco

Clerk

File No. 179-93-1

APR 29 1993

Date Approved

Mayor

FILE NO. 186-93-1 ORDINANCE NO. 124-93

[Transfer of Steam Franchise]

APPROVING TRANSFER OF THE STEAM FRANCHISE AUTHORIZED BY THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS UNDER ORDINANCE NO. 418-75 FROM THE PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY TO SAN FRANCISCO THERMAL, L.P.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. The purpose of this ordinance is to authorize the transfer of a franchise granted for the purposes of providing steam and heat to customers through conduits placed in city streets. The San Francisco Board of Supervisors, by enacting Ordinance No. 418-75 (the Steam Franchise Ordinance), authorized the Pacific Gas and Electric Company to construct, install, maintain and operate underground steam conduits in streets, alleys and other public places. The Pacific Gas and Electric Company has entered into an agreement transferring its steam conduits to San Francisco Thermal, L.P. This agreement is subject to the approval of the California Public Utilities Commission. In addition, section 8 of the Steam Franchise Ordinance provides that the franchise may be transferred to another entity only with the approval of the Board of Supervisors.

Section 2. In accordance with section 8 of the Steam Franchise Ordinance, transfer of this steam franchise by the Pacific Gas and Electric Company to San Francisco Thermal, L.P., is hereby approved. This transfer shall become effective upon the filing of

the steam conduit and franchise sale agreement, as approved by the California Public Utilities Commission, with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors.

Section 3. Except as modified by this ordinance, all terms and conditions of Ordinance No. 418-75 shall continue in full force and effect.

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

LOUISE H. RENNE, City Attorney

By: _____
Deputy City Attorney

Board of Supervisors, San Francisco

Passed for Second Reading	Finally Passed
April 12, 1993	April 19, 1993
Ayes: Supervisors Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Kaufman Kennedy Maher Migden Shelley	Ayes: Supervisors Achtenberg Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Kennedy Migden
Absent: Supervisors Achtenberg Hsieh	Absent: Supervisors Maher Shelley

I hereby certify that the foregoing ordinance was finally passed by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco

_____
Clerk

File No. 186-93-1

APR 29 1993
Date Approved

_____
Mayor

DOCUMENTS DEPT.
MAY 17 1993
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

[General Assistance Property & Grant Levels]

AMENDING THE SAN FRANCISCO ADMINISTRATIVE CODE BY AMENDING SECTIONS 20.56.10 AND 20.57 (GENERAL ASSISTANCE ORDINANCE) RELATING TO ALLOWABLE PERSONAL PROPERTY AND TO THE COMPUTATION OF AID GRANTS.

Note: Additions are <u>underlined</u>; deletions are indicated by ((double parentheses)).

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. The San Francisco Administrative Code is hereby amended by amending Section 20.56.10 thereof, to read as follows:

SEC. 20.56.10. ALLOWABLE PERSONAL PROPERTY.

No aid under this Chapter shall be granted or paid for any person who has not exhausted all assets and resources available to such person, except for those personal properties listed below:

(a) Cash assets not to exceed the current grant amount (such cash assets shall be offset against the current grant amount.)

(b) Savings or checking account not to exceed $25. Any amount exceeding $25 shall be offset against the current grant amount.

(c) Personal effects, exclusive of luxury jewelry.

(d) Household furnishings.

/ / /

(e) Tools, trade equipment and fixtures used in the individual's regular trade or work.

(f) Insurance policies of funds placed in trust for the provision of interment or for funeral expenses to the extent of not more than $600 per family.

(g) An interment plot for use by members of the applicant's or recipient's family.

(h) A vehicle with cash value of less than (($900)) <u>$1,800</u>.

Section 2. The San Francisco Adminstrative Code is hereby amended by amending sections 20.57 thereof to read as follows:

SECTION 20.57. COMPUTATION AND PAYMENT OF AID GRANTS; AMOUNTS PAYABLE.

(a) For each eligible individual or for each eligible family of two or more person who qualify for aid under the General Assistance Program, the maximum monthly amount of aid to which such recipients are entitled is listed below.

MAXIMUM GENERAL ASSISTANCE GRANT AMOUNT

Single Individual	(($235))	<u>$345</u>
Number of Eligible Person in Same Family		
2 Persons	(($395))	<u>$567</u>
3 Persons	(($480))	<u>$703</u>

/ / /

DOCUMENTS DEPT
MAY 17 1993
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

4 Persons	(($591))	$834
5 Persons	(($682))	$952
6 Persons	(($768))	$1070
7 Persons	(($845))	$1175
8 Persons	(($933))	$1281
9 Persons	(($1022))	$1388
10 Persons	(($1111))	$1508

In the case of more than 10 persons in a family budget unit, an additional $25 each month shall be paid for each additional person in the family budget unit. For the purpose of this section, a family is defined as a group of persons living together who are related by the first degree of consanguinity.

(b) With respect to all recipients, initial aid payments shall be conditional upon completion of the Department orientation and evaluation program. In addition, with respect to each employable recipient, continuing aid shall be conditioned, at the option of the Department, upon either completion of 20 verifiable job applications per month and/or participation in a Department approved job counseling, vocational rehabilitation, drug or alcohol treatment or work assignment program. In addition, with respect to each unemployable recipient, continuing aid shall be conditioned upon application in and pursuit of SSI/SSP benefits, if eligible, and participation in a Department approved rehabilitation program. Aid may be withheld, reduced, or discontinued for failure to meet these requirements.

(c) The Maximum General Assistance Grant may include a Municipal Railway Fast Pass or tokens as an in-kind grant, in which event the cost of the Municipal Railway Fast Pass or tokens to the Department of Social Services shall be deducted from the Maximum General Assistance Grant Amounts listed above to arrive at the Maximum Cash General Assistance Grant Amount which may be issued by means of warrants, vouchers or checks. The Municipal Railway Fast Pass or tokens shall be for the sole use of the recipient.

(d) The Maximum General Assistance Grant Amounts listed in Section 20.57(a) of this ordinance shall be adjusted automatically each July 1st beginning July 1, 1981, by the annual percentage cost of living increase or decrease to the Minimum Basic Standard of Adequate Care adopted by the California State Legislature in the Aid to Families with Dependent Children Program.

(e) The maximum monthly amount of aid for which an applicant is eligible shall be the Maximum General Assistance Grant Amount prorated as of the eligibility determination date, less any cash available to the applicant during that calendar month, and less the fair market value of any nonexempt personal property available to the applicant during that calendar month. Rent, retroactive to the first of the month in which eligibility was determined, may be authorized to prevent eviction from existing housing.

(f) The maximum monthly amount of aid for which a recipient is eligible shall be the Maximum General Assistance Grant Amount, or the amount determined pursuant to Section (b) less any cash received

from sources other than General Assistance which is or will be available to the recipient during the month for which aid is paid, and less the fair market value of any nonexempt personal property which is or will be available to the recipient during the month for which aid is paid.

(g) No grant shall be issued for less than $5.

(h) To promote the transition of General Assistance recipients to gainful employment, the General Manager of the Department of Social Services may establish ((for a two year pilot period)) an Income and Asset Disregard Program for recipients who are employed. The Income and Asset Disregard Program shall provide for disregarding a certain amount of gross income which a recipient earns as wages and savings derived therefrom when determining a recipient's General Assistance Program eligibility and grant amount. The total amount of gross income disregarded shall not exceed the sum of the following amounts:
(1) all of the first one hundred dollars ($100.00) of recipient gross wage earnings; (2) two thirds (2/3) of the second one hundred dollars (100.00) of recipient gross wage earnings; (3) one half (1/2) of the third one hundred dollars ($100.00) of recipient gross wage earnings; (4) one third (1/3) of the fourth one hundred dollars ($100.00) of recipient gross wage earnings, and; (5) one fifth (1/5) of the fifth one hundred dollars ($100.00) of recipient gross wage earnings. All recipient gross wage earnings above five hundred dollars ($500.00) shall be offset on a dollar for dollar basis

against the grant amount to which a recipient would otherwise be entitled. In addition, for recipients participating in this program up to fifteen hundred dollars ($1,500.00) of recipient savings derived from the recipient's gross wage earnings shall be disregarded during the recipient's participation in this program and for up to three months thereafter. Also, if as a result of retrospective budgeting a recipient's total currently available financial resources in a month including his or her adjusted General Assistance grant, wages, and savings are less than the maximum General Assistance grant amount, the recipient shall be eligible for a grant supplement in the form of a rental expense voucher for unpaid rend in that month and up to $50 in cash so that the recipient's currently available financial resources may total up to the maximum General Assistance grant amount. This grant supplement is available a maximum of three times per year for program participants and is not available to recipients who quit a job without good cause.

Recipient gross wage earnings are defined for purposes of this section as any income received by the recipient as payment for a recipient's labor. This section supercedes the provisions of Subsection 20.55.2(m), Section 20.56.6, Subsections 20.56.10(a) and (b), Subsections 20.57 (e) and (f), and Subsections 20.59.10(d), (e) and (f) when determining recipient eligibility and when calculating the maximum monthly amount of aid for program participants. All other recipient income and assets shall continue to be offset on a

DOCUMENTS DEPT.
MAY 17 1993
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

dollar for dollar basis when calculating the grant amount to which a recipient is otherwise eligible. For recipients participating in this program, General Assistance eligibility shall be determined on a monthly basis and a recipient's grant amount shall be adjusted for gross wage earnings on the basis of retrospective budgeting in the month following the recipient's receipt of wage income. Verified expenses which exceed the total sum of a participant's grant, wages, and savings in any given month create a rebuttable presumption of ineligibility for aid.

Every twelve months, commencing June 1, 1994, and ending June 1, 1996, the General Manager shall report to the Board of Supervisors and to the Mayor the progress and results of the program to date. ((At the end of the two year pilot period, the general manager shall report to the Board of Supervisors and to the Mayor the results of the pilot project, including at least the following information: (a) the costs and savings to the General Assistance and the Food Stamps Programs, (b) the number of recipients who utilize the income and asset disregards. (c) the number of recipients in the GATES program who utilize the disregards, (d) the amount of recipient earnings for participants in the Income and Asset Disregard Programs, (e) the number of recipients who leave the General Assistance program due to earned income immediately following participation in the Income and Asset Disregard Programs.))

/ / /

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
2025H/mm

(i) The automatic adjustment provisions of subsection (d) are hereby suspended for fiscal year 1993-94. Adjustments for subsequent fiscal years made pursuant to this section shall not include any adjustments for any fiscal year in which the cost of living was suspended.

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

LOUISE H. RENNE, CITY ATTORNEY

By: Viviane Dana Elizondo
DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY

Board of Supervisors, San Francisco

Passed for Second Reading	Finally Passed
April 19, 1993	April 26, 1993
Ayes: Supervisors Achtenberg Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Kennedy Maher Migden Shelley	Ayes: Supervisors Alioto Bierman Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Kennedy Maher Migden Shelley
	Absent: Supervisors Achtenberg Conroy

I hereby certify that the foregoing ordinance was finally passed by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco

John L. Taylor
Clerk

File No.
97-93-18

APR 30 1993
Date Approved

Frank M. Jordan
Mayor

FILE NO. 45-93-18 ORDINANCE NO. 126-93

RO #92204

CC

(SETTLEMENT OF LAWSUIT)

AUTHORIZING SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION OF LYNN BARFIELD AGAINST THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO for $30,250.00.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. The City Attorney is hereby authorized to settle the action entitled "Lynn Barfield v. City and County of San Francisco, "San Francisco Superior Court No. 924-461, by the payment of $30,250.00

APPROVED AS TO FORM AND RECOMMENDED:

LOUISE H. RENNE
City Attorney

PATRICK J. MAHONEY
Chief Trial Deputy

RECOMMENDED:

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

JOHN E. CRIBBS
Director

FUNDS AVAILABLE:

EDWARD M. HARRINGTON
Controller

01 001 97 09 90
309674 1450 $30,250.00 MAR 25 1993

APPROVED:

RUDOLF NOTHENBERG
Chief Administrative Officer

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS 7324n

Board of Supervisors, San Francisco

Passed for Second Reading	§	Finally Passed
April 26, 1993	§	May 3, 1993
Ayes: Supervisors Alioto Bierman Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Kennedy Maher Migden Shelley	§	Ayes: Supervisors Achtenberg Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Kennedy Migden Shelley
Absent: Supervisors Achtenberg Conroy	§	Absent: Supervisor Maher

I hereby certify that the foregoing ordinance was finally passed by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco

Clerk

File No. 45-93-18

MAY 07 1993
Date Approved

Mayor

DOCUMENTS DEPT.
MAY 17 1993
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

FILE NO. 45-93-19

ORDINANCE NO. 127-93

RO #92205

CC

[SETTLEMENT OF LAWSUIT]

AUTHORIZING SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION OF BERTHA CHAPA AGAINST THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO for $10,000.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section I. The City Attorney is hereby authorized to settle the action entitled "BERTHA CHAPA v. CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, et al.," Superior Court No. 934-358, by the payment of $10,000.

APPROVED AS TO FORM AND RECOMMENDED:

LOUISE H. RENNE
City Attorney

PATRICK J. MAHONEY
Chief Trial Deputy

RECOMMENDED:

MARY E. BURNS
Director

FUNDS AVAILABLE:

EDWARD M. HARRINGTON
Controller

01 001 97 09 42
620245 1450 $10,000.00

6481n

MAR 25 1993

APPROVED:

SECRETARY
Recreation and Park Commission

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Board of Supervisors, San Francisco

Passed for Second Reading	§	Finally Passed
April 26, 1993	§	May 3, 1993
Ayes: Supervisors Alioto Bierman Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Kennedy Maher Migden Shelley	§	Ayes: Supervisors Achtenberg Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Kennedy Migden Shelley
Absent: Supervisors Achtenberg Conroy	§	Absent: Supervisor Maher

I hereby certify that the foregoing ordinance was finally passed by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco

Clerk

File No. 45-93-19

MAY 07 1993

Date Approved

Mayor

DOCUMENTS DEPT.
MAY 17 1993
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

FILE NO. 166-93-2.1 ORDINANCE NO. 128-93

[Settlement of Lawsuit]

AUTHORIZING SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION OF CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO AGAINST ALEXANDER METLENKO AND HELEN F. METLENKO BY ACCEPTING CONSIDERATION IN THE TOTAL AMOUNT OF $10,000 PAYABLE IN CASH AND DISCHARGING SAID PERSONS ABOVE-NAMED FROM FURTHER LIABILITY.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. The Tax Collector Attorney is hereby authorized and directed to settle the controversy in San Francisco Municipal Court No. 088773 entitled, CCSF v. ALEXANDER METLENKO AND HELEN F. METLINKO, by accepting the total amount of $10,000 payable in cash upon final enactment of this ordinance.

Section 2. After payment of the amount specified in Section 1, the Tax Collector Attorney is further directed to release said Alexander Metlenko and Helen F. Metlenko from all liability for debts arising out of the San Francisco Municipal Court action No. 088773; and to prepare and file a dismissal with prejudice promptly after receiving the payment.

Section 3. It is expressly understood that any default in the payment in Section 1 shall have the effect of nullifying the compromise which is the subject of this ordinance and shall entitle

///

///

the City and County of San Francisco to pursue all of its legal rights as a creditor litigant in San Francisco Municipal Court action No. 088773.

RECOMMENDED BY:

THAD BROWN
Tax Collector

APPROVED BY:

MARY I. CALLANAN
Treasurer

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

LOUISE H. RENNE
City Attorney

By: Theodore R. Lakey
Deputy City Attorney

Board of Supervisors, San Francisco

Passed for Second Reading	Finally Passed
April 26, 1993	May 3, 1993
Ayes: Supervisors Alioto Bierman Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Kennedy Maher Migden Shelley	Ayes: Supervisors Achtenberg Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Kennedy Migden Shelley
Absent: Supervisors Achtenberg Conroy	Absent: Supervisor Maher

I hereby certify that the foregoing ordinance was finally passed by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco

Clerk

File No. 166-93-2.1

MAY 07 1993
Date Approved

Mayor

DOCUMENTS DEPT
MAY 17 1993
SAN FRANCISCO PUBLIC LIBRARY

as presented in committee
April 21, 1993.

FILE NO. 125-93-2

ORDINANCE NO. 129-93

(Housing Code)

AMENDING PART II, CHAPTER XII OF THE SAN FRANCISCO MUNICIPAL CODE (HOUSING CODE) BY AMENDING SECTION 302 TO AUTHORIZE THE BUREAU OF BUILDING INSPECTION TO INSPECT AN APARTMENT HOUSE OR HOTEL LESS FREQUENTLY THAN ONCE A YEAR IF THE APARTMENT HOUSE OR HOTEL HAS AN ESTABLISHED RECORD OF COMPLIANCE WITH CODE REQUIREMENTS.

NOTE: Additions are underlined; deletions are indicated by ((double parentheses)).

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. Part II, Chapter XII of the San Francisco Municipal Code (Housing Code) is hereby amended by amending Section 302 to read as follows:

SEC. 302. FEES. (a) Apartment House License Fees. Every individual or business operating an apartment house shall pay an annual license fee. The license fee is due and payable on the first day of October of each year. When the license fee has been paid in full for the applicable year and a change of ownership occurs during that year, the new owner shall be liable for only an administrative fee to defray the cost of issuing a new permit.

The license fee will be used to defray the cost of inspection and regulation by the Bureau of Building Inspection. This inspection will be made by the Bureau of Building Inspection at least once a year; provided, however, that the Superintendent

of the Bureau of Building Inspection is authorized to waive the annual inspection requirement if he or she determines that the apartment house has an established record of compliance with code requirements. In those cases where the Superintendent has waived the annual inspection requirement, an inspection will be made at least once every three years. Additional inspections within any year may be required. Permits of Occupancy will not be issued by the Bureau of Building Inspection without said license having been obtained. See Building Code, Section 333.1 (Apartment House License Fee Schedule) for the applicable fees.

(b) Hotel License Fees. Every individual or business operating a hotel shall pay an annual license fee. The license fee is due and payable on the first day of January of each year. When the license fee has been paid in full for the applicable year and a change of ownership occurs during that year, the new owner shall be liable for only an administrative fee to defray the cost of issuing a new permit.

The license fee will be used to defray the cost of inspection and regulation by the Bureau of Building Inspection. This inspection will be made by the Bureau of Building Inspection at least once a year; provided, however, that the Superintendent of the Bureau of Building Inspection is authorized to waive the annual inspection requirement if he or she determines that the hotel has an established record of compliance with code requirements. In those cases where the Superintendent has waived

DOCUMENTS DEPT
MAY 17 1993
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

the annual inspection requirement, an inspection will be made at least once every three years. Additional inspections within any year may be required. Permits of Occupancy will not be issued by the Bureau of Building Inspection without said license having been obtained. See Building Code, Section 333.1 (Hotel License Fee Schedule) for the applicable fees.

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

LOUISE H. RENNE
City Attorney

By Judith A. Boyajian
Deputy City Attorney

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

CC

Board of Supervisors, San Francisco

Passed for Second Reading	Finally Passed
April 26, 1993	May 3, 1993
Ayes: Supervisors Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Kennedy Maher Migden Shelley	Ayes: Supervisors Achtenberg Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Kennedy Migden Shelley
Absent: Supervisor Achtenberg	Absent: Supervisor Maher

I hereby certify that the foregoing ordinance was finally passed by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco

John L. Taylor
Clerk

File No.
125-93-2

MAY 07 1993
Date Approved

Frank M. Jordan
Mayor

4/28/93

FILE NO. 101-92-66 ORDINANCE NO. 130-93

(Government Funding) RO# 92209 SA# 38

kg 4/28/93

APPROPRIATING $500,000 FOR PROGRAM PROJECT BUDGET (SPECIAL ELECTION FUND), REGISTRAR OF VOTERS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1992 - 93 ; placing $175,000 on reserve.

Be it ordained by the people of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. FUNDS ARE HEREBY APPROPRIATED FOR FY 1992-93 AS FOLLOWS:

Department and Number	Source of Funds and Purpose of Appropriation	Amount Debit	Amount Credit
01 - 001	**General Fund**		
99 - 00 - 00	General Fund Unallocated		
GL 155 (119990)	Interfund Receivable		
Subsidiary 000078	SFUSD - Special Election Advance	$500,000	
80 - 00 - 00	**Registrar of Voters**		
Project 037 - 01	Special Election Fund		
20-2010 (430025)	Program Project Budget		$500,000

kg 4/28/93

Section. 2. Funds in the amount of $175,000 (Special Election Fund) are hereby placed on reserve, to be released by the Budget Committee.

APPROVED AS TO FORM:
LOUISE H. RENNE, CITY ATTORNEY

BY: [signature]
DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY

FUNDS AVAILABLE:

[signature]
CONTROLLER

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Board of Supervisors, San Francisco

Passed for Second Reading
May 3, 1993
Ayes: Supervisors Achtenberg Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Kennedy Maher Migden Shelley

Finally Passed
May 10, 1993
Ayes: Supervisors Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Kennedy Maher Migden
Absent: Supervisors Achtenberg Shelley

I hereby certify that the foregoing ordinance was finally passed by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco

[signature]
ACTING Clerk

File No. 101-92-66

MAY 1 1 1993
Date Approved

[signature]
Mayor

DOCUMENTS DEPT.
MAY 17 1993
SAN FRANCISCO PUBLIC LIBRARY

[Filing of Campaign Statements]

AMENDING CHAPTER 16 OF THE SAN FRANCISCO ADMINISTRATIVE CODE BY ADDING ARTICLE XIIB THERETO TO REQUIRE CANDIDATES AND POLITICAL COMMITTEES TO FILE COPIES OF THEIR CAMPAIGN STATEMENTS ON COMPUTER DISKETTE.

Note: This entire Article is new.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Chapter 16 of the San Francisco Administrative Code is hereby amended by adding Article XIIB thereto to read as follows:

ARTICLE XIIB

ELECTRONIC FILING OF CAMPAIGN STATEMENTS

SEC. 16.535 FINDINGS AND PURPOSE.

(a) State and local law require candidates, persons supporting or opposing ballot measures and certain other types of committees to file campaign finance statements with the Registrar of Voters detailing the sources of their contributions and how they have expended those contributions. The purpose of these laws is to assist voters in making informed electoral decisions. These laws also assist to ensure compliance with campaign contribution laws.

(b) Frequently, these disclosure reports are extremely lengthy. Moreover, literally hundreds of such reports are filed

with the Registrar of Voters Office each reporting period. It is extremely difficult for members of the public, the media and election officials efficiently to review and compare these statements.

(c) The Board of supervisors finds that requiring political committees that meet certain financial thresholds to file copies of their campaign statements on computer diskettes or other designated electronic media will further the purposes of campaign finance disclosure laws.

SEC. 16.536 DEFINITIONS.

Whenever in this Article the following works or phrases are used, they shall mean:

(a) "Candidate" shall be defined as set forth in the California Political Reform Act (Government Code Sections §1000 et seq.), provided that the term "candidate" shall be limited to candidates for City and County office.

(b) "Committee" shall mean any persons or group of persons which:

(1) is required to file a statement of organization under California Political Reform Act (Government Code Sections 1000 et seq.; and

(2) is controlled by a candidate, or is formed or existing primarily to support or oppose a candidate, or is formed or existing primarily to support or oppose a ballot measure which is being voted

DOCUMENTS DEPT.
JUN 3 1993
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

on only in the City and County, or is a general purpose committee active only in the City and County; and

(3) receives contributions, or makes independent expenditures, totaling five thousand dollars ($5,000) or more in a calendar year. ~~or has had its original statement of organization on file with the Office of the Registrar of Voters for two years or longer.~~

mlr
4/21/93

(c) "Contribution" shall be defined as set forth in the California Political Reform Act (Government Code sections 81000 et seq.).

(d) "General Purpose Committee" shall be defined as set forth in the California Political Reform Act (Government Code Section 81000 et seq.)

(e) "Independent Expenditure" shall be defined as set forth in the California Political Reform Act (Government Code Sections 81000 et seq.)

SEC. 16.537. FILING OF CAMPAIGN STATEMENTS.

Whenever any elected City and County officer, candidate or committee is required by California Political Reform Act (Government Code Section 8100 et seq.) to file a semi-annual campaign statement, a preelection campaign statement or a supplemental preelection campaign statement with the Registrar of Voters, the elected officer, candidate or committee shall file at the same time a copy of the report on a computer diskette, or other electronic media, in

a format prescribed by the Registrar of Voters, provided the Registrar has prescribed the format at least 60 days before the statement or report is due to be filed.

SEC. 16.538 PENALTIES FOR LATE FILING. Any person who files an electronic copy of a statement or report required by this Article after the deadline imposed by the California Political Reform Act (Government Code Section 81000 et seq.) for filing the written copy of the statement or report shall be liable in the same amount and on the same terms as set forth in the Act for the late filing of the written copy of the campaign statement or report.

SEC 16.539 SEVERABILITY. The provisions of this Article are declared to be separate and severable. The invalidity of any clause, sentence, paragraph, subdivision, section or portion of this Article, or the invalidity of the application thereof to any person or circumstances, shall not affect the validity of remainder of this Article, or the validity of its application to other persons or circumstances.

APPROVED AS TO FORM:
LOUISE H. RENNE, City Attorney

By: _____
Deputy City Attorney

Board of Supervisors, San Francisco

Passed for Second Reading	§	Finally Passed
	§	
May 3, 1993	§	May 10, 1993
	§	
	§	
Ayes: Supervisors Achtenberg Alioto Bierman Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Migden Shelley	§	Ayes: Supervisors Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Migden Shelley
	§	
Noes: Supervisors Kennedy Maher	§	Noes: Supervisors Kennedy Maher
	§	
Absent: Supervisor Conroy	§	Absent: Supervisor Achtenberg

I hereby certify that the foregoing ordinance was finally passed by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco

John L. Taylor
Clerk

File No.
97-93-4

MAY 17 1993
Date Approved

Frank M. Jordan
Mayor

FILE NO. 101-92-62

Budget Cmte

ORDINANCE NO. 132-93

(Government Funding)

RO# 92212 SA# 106

APPROPRIATING $77,131 FOR PROGRAM PROJECT BUDGET (REPAIR & DEMOLITION), FOR FISCAL YEAR 1992 - 93.

Be it ordained by the people of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. FUNDS ARE HEREBY APPROPRIATED FOR FY 1992-93 AS FOLLOWS:

Department and Number	Source of Funds and Purpose of Appropriation	Amount Debit	Amount Credit
02 - 100	**Special Revenue Fund**		
90 - 03 - 00	**Public Works**		
GL 301 (004267)	Unreserved Fund Balance	$77,131	
Project 001 - 01	Repair and Demolition		
20-2010 (774117)	Program Project Budget		$77,131

APPROVED AS TO FORM:
LOUISE H. RENNE, CITY ATTORNEY

BY: [signature]
DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY

FUNDS AVAILABLE:

[signature]
CONTROLLER

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Board of Supervisors, San Francisco

Passed for Second Reading	Finally Passed
May 3, 1993	May 10, 1993
Ayes: Supervisors Achtenberg Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Kennedy Migden Shelley	Ayes: Supervisors Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Kennedy Maher Migden
Absent: Supervisor Maher	Absent: Supervisors Achtenberg Shelley

I hereby certify that the foregoing ordinance was finally passed by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco.

[signature]
Clerk

MAY 17 1993
Date Approved

[signature]
Mayor

File No.
101-92-62

DOCUMENTS DEPT
JUN 3 1993
S.F. PUBLIC LIBRARY

Budget Cmte

FILE NO. 101-92-63 ORDINANCE NO. 133-93

(Government Funding) RO# 92213 SA# 41

APPROPRIATING AND CERTIFYING $32,440 FOR FACILITIES MAINTENANCE PROJECT TO COVER 10% OVERAGE AS PER CHARTER SECTION 7.203, PROVIDING FOR RATIFICATION OF ACTION PREVIOUSLY TAKEN, DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1992 - 93.

Be it ordained by the people of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. FUNDS ARE HEREBY APPROPRIATED FOR FY 1992-93 AS FOLLOWS:

Department and Number	Source of Funds and Purpose of Appropriation	Amount Debit	Amount Credit
35 - 801	**Sewer Repair and Replacement Fund**		
90 - 06 - 00	**Public Works**		
Project 637 - 40	Brannan Sewer Replacement		
20-2020 (542985)	Facilities Maintenance Project	$32,440	$32,440

Section 2. Although the City has incurred no legal obligation under the Charter, the Board of Supervisors does hereby appropriate the funds necessary for the obligation and does hereby ratify the action previously taken.

APPROVED AS TO FORM:
LOUISE H. RENNE, CITY ATTORNEY

BY: [signature]
DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY

FUNDS AVAILABLE:

[signature]
CONTROLLER

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Board of Supervisors, San Francisco

Passed for Second Reading

May 3, 1993

Ayes: Supervisors Achtenberg Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Kennedy Maher Migden Shelley

Finally Passed

May 10, 1993

Ayes: Supervisors Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Kennedy Maher Migden

Absent: Supervisors Achtenberg Shelley

I hereby certify that the foregoing ordinance was finally passed by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco

[signature]
Clerk

File No. 101-92-63

MAY 17 1993
Date Approved

[signature]
Mayor

DOCUMENTS DEPT.
JUN 3 1993
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

Budget Cmte

FILE NO. 101-92-64 ORDINANCE NO. 134-93

(Government Funding) RO# 92215 SA# 88

APPROPRIATING $39,621,938 FOR VARIOUS CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS AND RESCINDING $39,621,938 FROM VARIOUS CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS, AIRPORT COMMISSION FOR FISCAL YEAR 1992 - 93.

Be it ordained by the people of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. FUNDS ARE HEREBY APPROPRIATED FOR FY 1992-93 AS FOLLOWS:

Department and Number	Source of Funds and Purpose of Appropriation	Amount Debit	Amount Credit
30 - 714	**Capital Project Fund - Groundside**		
27 - 00 - 00	Airport		
Project 999 - 99	Revenue Transfer In # 30 - 700		
20-2030 (574715)	Capital Improvement Project	$7,000,000	
Project 995 - 01	Revenue Transfer to Other Cost Center		
49-4900 (916817)	Revenue Transfer Out to # 30 - 715, Capital Project Fund - Airfield Support		$7,000,000
	Total - Capital Project Fund - Groundside	$7,000,000	$7,000,000
30 - 715	**Capital Project Fund - Airfield Support**		
Project 995 - 99	Revenue Transfer to Other Cost Center		
99-9990 (236414)	Revenue Transfer In From # 30 - 714, Capital Project Fund - Groundside	$7,000,000	
Project 999 - 99	Revenue Transfer In # 30 - 700		
20-2030 (574723)	Capital Improvement Project		$7,000,000
	Total - Capital Proj. Fund - Airfield Support	$7,000,000	$7,000,000
30 - 803	**FAA Funded Project - Terminals**		
Project 999 - 99	Revenue Transfer In # 30 - 857		
20-2030 (574756)	Capital Improvement Project	$5,000,000	
Project 995 - 01	Revenue Transfer to Other Cost Center		
49-4900 (916825)	Revenue Transfer Out to # 30 - 801, FAA Funded Project - Utility Systems		$5,000,000
	Total - FAA Funded Projects - Terminals	$5,000,000	$5,000,000
30 - 801	**FAA Funded Project - Utility Systems**		
Project 995 - 99	Revenue Transfer to Other Cost Center		
99-9990 (236422)	Revenue Transfer In From # 30 - 803, FAA Funded Project - Terminal	$5,000,000	
Project 999 - 99	Revenue Transfer In # 30 - 857		
20-2030 (574731)	Capital Improvement Project - Utility Systems		$5,000,000
	Total - FAA Funded Project-Utility Systems	$5,000,000	$5,000,000
30 - 812	**1967 Bond Fund - Airfield**		
Project 999 - 99	Revenue Transfer In # 30 - 863		
20-2030 (574780)	Capital Improvement Project	$54,740	
Project 995 - 01	Revenue Transfer to Other Cost Center		
49-4900 (916833)	Revenue Transfer Out to # 30 - 813, 1967 Bond Fund - Terminal		$54,740
	Total - 1967 Bond Fund - Airfield	$54,740	$54,740

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

DOCUMENTS DEPT.
JUN 3 1993
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

30 - 813	**1967 Bond Fund - Terminal**		
Project 995 - 99	Revenue Transfer to Other Cost Center		
99-9990 (236430)	Revenue Transfer Out From # 30 - 812, 1967 Bond Fund - Airfield	$54,740	
Project 999-99	Revenue Transfer In # 30 - 863		
20-2030 (574798)	Capital Improvement Project		$54,740
	Total - 1967 Bond Fund - Terminal	$54,740	$54,740
30 - 822	**1975 Revenue Bond - Airfield**		
Project 999 - 99	**Revenue Transfer In # 30 - 869**		
20-2030 (574806)	Capital Improvement Project	$14,532	
Project 995 - 01	Revenue Transfer to Other Cost Center		
49-4900 (916783)	Revenue Transfer Out to # 30 - 823, 1975 Revenue Bond - Terminal		$14,532
	Total - 1975 Revenue Bond - Airfield	$14,532	$14,532
30 - 823	**1975 Revenue Bond - Terminal**		
Project 995-99	**Revenue Transfer to Other Cost Center**		
99-9990 (236380)	**Revenue Transfer In From # 30 - 822, 1975** Revenue Bond - Airfield	$14,532	
Project 999-99	Revenue Transfer In # 30 - 869		
20-2030 (575167)	Capital Improvement Project		$14,532
	Total - 1975 Revenue Bond - Terminal	$14,532	$14,532

30 - 824	**1975 Revenue Bond - Groundside**		
Project 999-99	Revenue Transfer In # 30 - 869		
20-2030 (575175)	Capital Improvement Project	$46,321	
Project 995 - 01	Revenue Transfer to Other Cost Center		
49-4900 (916791)	Revenue Transfer Out to # 30 - 823, 1975 Revenue Bond - Terminal		$46,321
	Total - 1975 Revenue Bond - Groundside	$46,321	$46,321
30 - 823	**1975 Revenue Bond - Terminal**		
Project 995 -99	Revenue Transfer to Other Cost Center		
99 9990 (236398)	Revenue Transfer In From # 30 - 824, 1975 Revenue Bond - Groundside	$46,321	
Project 999-99	Revenue Transfer In # 30 - 869		
20-2030 (575167)	Capital Improvement Project		$46,321
	Total - 1975 Revenue Bond - Terminal	$46,321	$46,321
30 - 825	**1975 Revenue Bond - Airfield Support**		
Project 999 - 99	Revenue Transfer In # 30 - 869		
20-2030 (575183)	Capital Improvement Project	$509,184	
Project 995 - 01	Revenue Transfer to Other Cost Center		
49-4900 (916809)	Revenue Transfer Out to # 30 - 823, 1975 Revenue Bond - Terminal		$509,184
	Total - 1975 Revenue Bond-Airfield Suppor	$509,184	$509,184

30 - 823	**1975 Revenue Bond - Terminal**		
Project 995 - 97	Revenue Transfer to Other Cost Center		
99-9990 (236406)	Revenue Transfer In From # 30 - 825, 1975 Revenue Bond - Airfield Support	$509,184	
Project 999 - 99	Revenue Transfer In # 30 - 869		
20-2030 (575167)	Capital Improvement Project		$509,184
	Total - 1975 Revenue Bond - Terminal	**$509,184**	**$509,184**
30 - 834	**1975 Revenue Bond - Groundside**		
Project 999 - 99	Revenue Transfer In # 30 - 871		
20-2030 (574822)	Capital Improvement Project	$1,386,192	
Project 995 - 01	Revenue Transfer to Other Cost Center		
49-4900 (916841)	Revenue Transfer Out to # 30 - 832, 1977 Revenue Bond - Airfield		$1,386,192
	Total - 1975 Revenue Bond - Groundside	**$1,386,192**	**$1,386,192**
30 - 832	**1977 Revenue Bond - Airfield**		
Project 995 - 99	Revenue Transfer to Other Cost Center		
99-9990 (236448)	Revenue Transfer In From # 30 -834, 1977 Revenue Bond - Groundside	$1,386,192	
Project 999 - 99	Revenue Transfer In # 30 - 871		
20-2030 (574814)	Capital Improvement Project		$1,386,192
	Total - 1977 Revenue Bond - Airfield	**$1,386,192**	**$1,386,192**

30 - 843	**1981 Revenue Bond - Terminal**		
Project 999 - 99	Revenue Transfer In # 30 - 872		
20-2030 (574855)	Capital Improvement Project	$3,000,000	
Project 995 - 01	Revenue Transfer to Other Cost Center		
49-4900 (916858)	Revenue Transfer Out to # 30 - 841, 1981 Revenue Bond - Utilities		$3,000,000
	Total - 1981 Revenue Bond - Terminal	**$3,000,000**	**$3,000,000**
30 - 841	**1981 Revenue Bond - Utilities**		
Project 995 - 99	Revenue Transfer to Other Cost Center		
99-9990 (236455)	Revenue Transfer In From # 30 - 843, 1981 Revenue Bond - Terminal	$3,000,000	
Project 999 - 99	Revenue Transfer In # 30 - 872		
20-2030 (574830)	Capital Improvement Project		$3,000,000
	Total - 1981 Revenue Bond - Utilities	**$3,000,000**	**$3,000,000**
30 - 843	**1981 Revenue Bond - Terminal**		
Project 999 - 99	Revenue Transfer In # 30 - 872		
20-2030 (574855)	Capital Improvement Project	$2,800,000	
Project 995 - 02	Revenue Transfer to Other Cost Center		
49-4900 (916866)	Revenue Transfer Out to # 30 - 844, 1981 Revenue Bond - Grounside		$2,800,000
	Total - 1981 Revenue Bond - Terminal	**$2,800,000**	**$2,800,000**

DOCUMENTS DEPT.
JUN 3 1993
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

30 - 844	1981 Revenue Bond - Groundside		
Project 995 - 99	Revenue Transfer to Other Cost Center		
99-9990 (236463)	Revenue Transfer In From # 30 - 843, 1981 Revenue Bond - Terminal	$2,800,000	
Project 999 - 99	Revenue Transfer In # 30 - 872		
20-2030 (574863)	Capital Improvement Project		$2,800,000
	Total - 1981 Revenue Bond - Groundside	$2,800,000	$2,800,000
	Grand Total	$39,621,938	$39,621,938

APPROVED AS TO FORM:
LOUISE H. RENNE, CITY ATTORNEY

BY: [signature]
DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY

FUNDS AVAILABLE:

[signature]
CONTROLLER

Board of Supervisors, San Francisco

Passed for Second Reading

May 3, 1993

Ayes: Supervisors Achtenberg Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Kennedy Migden Shelley

Absent: Supervisor Maher

Finally Passed

May 10, 1993

Ayes: Supervisors Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Kennedy Maher Migden

Absent: Supervisors Achtenberg Shelley

I hereby certify that the foregoing ordinance was finally passed by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco

[signature]
Clerk

File No.
101-92-64

MAY 17 1993
Date Approved

[signature]
Mayor

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

FILE NO. 101-92-65

Budget Cmte

ORDINANCE NO. 135-93

(Government Funding)

RO# 92217 SA# 86 & 87

APPROPRIATING $7,051,304 FOR VARIOUS CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS AND AND RESCINDING $6,021,425 FROM CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECT (AIRFIELD IMPROVEMENT) AND $1,029,879 FROM THE BOND RESERVE PAYMENT, AIRPORT COMMISSION FOR FISCAL YEAR 1992 - 93.

Be it ordained by the people of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. FUNDS ARE HEREBY APPROPRIATED FOR FY 1992-93 AS FOLLOWS:

Department and Number	Source of Funds and Purpose of Appropriation	Amount Debit	Amount Credit
30 - 700	**Airport - Capital Improvement Fund**		
27 - 00 - 00	**Airport**		
Project 650 - 01	**Airfield Improvements**		
20-2030 (570614)	Capital Improvement Project	$6,021,425	
Project 650 - 90	Revenue Transfer Out - ACP		
49-4900 (916684)	Revenue Transfer Out to # 30 - 872, 1981 Airport Revenue Bond Fund		$6,021,425
	Total - Airport Capital Improvement Fund	**$6,021,425**	**$6,021,425**
30 - 872	**1981 Airport Revenue Bond Fund**		
Project 999 - 99	Revenue Transfer In		
99-9990 (236281)	Revenue Transfer In From # 30 - 700, Airport Capital Improvement Fund	$6,021,425	
Project 200 - 01	Airfield Improvements		
20-2030 (573964)	Capital Improvement Project		$6,021,425
	Total - Airport Revenue Bond Fund	**$6,021,425**	**$6,021,425**
30 - 001	**Airport Operating Fund**		
27 - 00 - 00	**Airport**		
49-4900 (916291)	Revenue Transfer Out to # 30 - 520, Airport Contingency Fund		$1,029,879
40-4020 (570416)	Bond Reserve Payment	$1,029,879	
	Total - Airport Operating Fund	**$1,029,879**	**$1,029,879**
30 - 520	**Airport Contingency Fund**		
Project 001 - 99	**Revenue Transfer In**		
99-9990 (232272)	**Revenue Transfer In From # 30 - 001, Airport Operating Fund**	$1,029,879	
Project 001 - 01	Airport Contingency		
20-2030 (574012)	Capital Improvement Project		$1,029,879
	Total - Airport Contingency Fund	**$1,029,879**	**$1,029,879**
	Grand Total	**$7,051,304**	**$7,051,304**

APPROVED AS TO FORM:
LOUISE H. RENNE, CITY ATTORNEY

BY: [signature]
DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY

FUNDS AVAILABLE:

[signature]
CONTROLLER

DOCUMENTS DEPT.
JUN 3 1993
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

Board of Supervisors, San Francisco

Passed for Second Reading	Finally Passed
May 3, 1993	May 10, 1993
Ayes: Supervisors Achtenberg Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Kennedy Migden Shelley	Ayes: Supervisors Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Kennedy Maher Migden
Absent: Supervisor Maher	Absent: Supervisors Achtenberg Shelley

I hereby certify that the foregoing ordinance was finally passed by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco

John L. Taylor
Clerk

File No.
101-92-65

MAY 17 1993
Date Approved

Frank M. Jordan
Mayor

[Sale or Possession of Replica Hypodermic Needles or Syringes]

AMENDING THE SAN FRANCISCO POLICE CODE BY ADDING THERETO ARTICLE 41 AND SECTIONS 4100, 4101, 4102 AND 4103, PROHIBITING THE SALE OR POSSESSION OF REPLICA HYPODERMIC NEEDLES OR SYRINGES.

Note: These Sections are entirely new.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. The San Francisco Police Code is amended by adding thereto Article 41 and Sections 4100, 4101, 4102 and 4103, to read as follows:

ARTICLE 41

PROHIBITING THE SALE OR POSSESSION OF
REPLICA HYPODERMIC NEEDLES OR SYRINGES

SEC. 4100. FINDINGS. (a) The City and County of San Francisco has declared that a public health emergency exists in connection with the AIDS epidemic and the high rate of HIV infection among injection drug users and the corresponding high rate of transmission of the disease. The Department of Public Health is implementing a needle exchange program in order to prevent the further spread of HIV infection.

(b) Replicas of hypodermic syringes containing a red liquid are now being sold and possessed in the City and County of San Francisco. Many of the replicas are actually pens and pencils, or pieces of jewelry. The replicas are a serious public safety concern because there is no clear way to distinguish between real syringes and the replicas except on extremely close inspection. The replicas endanger the HIV education process by desensitizing persons to the seriousness of syringes.

(c) Replica syringes may also be frightening to persons who do not know if the syringes are real or replicas. Replica syringes may, as a result, be used in a manner that may be taken as threatening or dangerous, and may result in unwarranted responses that may likewise be threatening or dangerous. The replica or facsimile hypodermic needles or syringes and their public display are, as a result, potentially threatening to persons in the community and to the safety and welfare of the general public.

SEC. 4101. PROHIBITION OF SALE OF REPLICA HYPODERMIC NEEDLES OR SYRINGES. It shall be unlawful for any person, firm or corporation to sell, or, for purposes of sale, to exchange, give, loan, furnish, display, or market, or to utilize for promoting the sale of any merchandise, any replica or facsimile hypodermic needles or syringes in the City and County of San Francisco. The provisions of this subsection shall not apply to any replica or facsimile hypodermic needle or syringe which, because of its distinct color,

DOCUMENTS DEPT
JUN 3 1993
S. F. PUBLIC LIBRARY

exaggerated size, or other design feature, cannot reasonably be perceived to be a real needle or syringe.

SEC. 4102. POSSESSION OF REPLICA HYPODERMIC NEEDLES OR SYRINGES. (a) Prohibition of Public Possession. It shall be unlawful for any person, including a minor, to have in his or her visible possession in public areas a replica or facsimile hypodermic needle or syringe, the sale of which is prohibited by Section 4101 of the Police Code.

(b) Definitions.

"Visible possession" shall mean that the replica or facsimile hypodermic needle or syringe is within the possession of a person, and that the replica or facsimile hypodermic needle or syringe is visible to other persons.

"Public areas" shall mean areas which are owned, leased or controlled by a public entity and which are generally open to the general public, and areas privately owned, leased or controlled which are generally open to the public, including public buildings, public parks, public streets, sidewalks and roadways, public educational facilities, public malls and thoroughfares.

SEC. 4103. Enforcement. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Municipal Code, violation of Sections 4101 and 4102 shall not constitute a misdemeanor. The sole sanction for violation of these Sections shall be the confiscation and destruction of the

prohibited replica or facsimile needle or syringe. Confiscation shall be made by law enforcement officers of the City and County of San Francisco authorized to make arrests, and may be made by any officials of the San Francisco Unified School District who may be duly authorized and designated to confiscate replica or facsimile hypodermic needles or syringes under these Sections. These officers or officials shall deliver possession of confiscated replica or facsimile hypodermic needles or syringes to the Chief of Police for the conduct of a hearing at which further retention of the replica or facsimile hypodermic needles or syringes and their destruction will be considered. Following an opportunity for a due process hearing the Chief of Police may order the return or destruction of said needles or syringes.

The Chief of Police is directed to establish procedures for hearings conducted by the Chief of Police or his or her designee that will be scheduled and conducted promptly after the confiscation of a replica or facsimile needle or syringe. The purpose of the hearing authorized by this Section will be to enable the person from whom the needle or syringe was confiscated, or the owner of the needle or syringe, to establish that the needle or syringe was not in visible possession in a public area, or was not a replica or facsimile needle or syringe within the meaning of these Sections in violation of these Sections at or before the time the needle or syringe was seized by the officers or officials. No destruction of a replica or facsimile needle or syringe shall occur without a duly

noticed hearing having been made available to persons whose replica or facsimile needle or syringe was confiscated.

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

LOUISE H. RENNE, City Attorney

By: Theodore R. Lakey
Deputy City Attorney

Board of Supervisors, San Francisco

Passed for Second Reading	Finally Passed
May 3, 1993	May 10, 1993
Ayes: Supervisors Achtenberg Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Maher Shelley	Ayes: Supervisors Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Kennedy Maher Migden
Absent: Supervisors Kennedy Migden	Absent: Supervisors Achtenberg Shelley

I hereby certify that the foregoing ordinance was finally passed by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco

John Taylor
Clerk

File No.
121-93-2

MAY 17 1993
Date Approved

Frank M. Jordan
Mayor

FILE NO. 101-92-67 ORDINANCE NO. 137-93

(Government Funding) RO# 92210 SA# 105

APPROPRIATING $975,000 FOR FEES AND OTHER COMPENSATION AND RESCINDING $155,000 FROM FEES AND OTHER COMPENSATION, SUPERIOR COURT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1992 - 93.

Be it ordained by the people of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. FUNDS ARE HEREBY APPROPRIATED FOR FY 1992-93 AS FOLLOWS:

Department and Number	Source of Funds and Purpose of Appropriation	Amount Debit	Amount Credit
01 - 001	**General Fund**		
99 - 00 - 00	**General Fund Unallocated**		
GL 496 (000026)	Unappropriated Revenue Reserved		
Subsidiary 000006	General Reserve	$382,000	
97 - 00 - 00	**General City Responsibilities**		
02-0400 (309138)	Fees and Other Compensation	155,000	
10 - 00 - 00	**Superior Court**		
30-3180 (316083)	Services of Other Departments - Bldg. Repair	438,000	
02-0400	Fees and Other Compensation		$975,000
	Total	**$975,000**	**$975,000**

APPROVED AS TO FORM:
LOUISE H. RENNE, CITY ATTORNEY

BY: [signature]
DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY

FUNDS AVAILABLE:

[signature]
CONTROLLER

SUPERVISOR ALIOTO

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Board of Supervisors, San Francisco

Passed for Second Reading
May 10, 1993
Ayes: Supervisors Alioto, Bierman, Conroy, Hallinan, Hsieh, Kaufman, Kennedy, Maher, Migden
Absent: Supervisors Achtenberg Shelley

Finally Passed
May 17, 1993
Ayes: Supervisors Alioto, Bierman Conroy, Hallinan, Kaufman Kennedy, Migden Shelley
Absent: Supervisors Achtenberg Hsieh, Maher

I hereby certify that the foregoing ordinance was finally passed by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco

[signature]
Acting Clerk

5/20/93
Date Approved

[signature]
Mayor

File
101-92-67

DOCUMENTS DEPT.
JUN 3 1993
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

FILE NO. 27-93-6 ORDINANCE NO. 138-93

(Airport - Lease Modifications)

APPROVING MODIFICATION NO. 4 OF LEASE AND USE AGREEMENT BETWEEN ALASKA AIRLINES, INC. AND CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, ACTING BY AND THROUGH ITS AIRPORTS COMMISSION.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. Pursuant to Section 7.402-1 of the Charter, the Board of Supervisors hereby approves Modification No. 4 of the Lease and Use Agreement between Alaska Airlines, Inc. and the City and County of San Francisco, acting by and through its Airports Commission, copies of which Modification is contained in Board of Supervisors' file number 27-93-6.

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

LOUISE H. RENNE

City Attorney

By [signature]

Deputy City Attorney

Board of Supervisors, San Francisco

Passed for Second Reading	Finally Passed
May 10, 1993	May 17, 1993
Ayes: Supervisors Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Kennedy Maher Migden Shelley	Ayes: Supervisors Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Kaufman Kennedy Migden Shelley
Absent: Supervisor Achtenberg	Absent: Supervisors Achtenberg Hsieh Maher

I hereby certify that the foregoing ordinance was finally passed by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco

[signature]
Acting Clerk

File No. 27-93-6

MAY 25 1993
Date Approved

[signature]
Mayor

DOCUMENTS DEPT
JUN 3 1993
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

FILE NO. 27-93-7 ORDINANCE NO. 227-93

(Airport - Lease Modifications)

APPROVING MODIFICATION NO. 5 OF LEASE AND USE AGREEMENT BETWEEN NORTHWEST AIRLINES, INC. AND CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, ACTING BY AND THROUGH ITS AIRPORTS COMMISSION.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. Pursuant to Section 7.402-1 of the Charter, the Board of Supervisors hereby approves Modification No. 5 of the Lease and Use Agreement between Northwest Airlines, Inc. and the City and County of San Francisco, acting by and through its Airports Commission, copies of which Modification is contained in Board of Supervisors' file number 27-93-7.

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

LOUISE H. RENNE

City Attorney

By Gretchen Nichol

Deputy City Attorney

2740M

Board of Supervisors, San Francisco

Passed for Second Reading	Finally Passed
May 10, 1993	May 17, 1993
Ayes: Supervisors Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Kennedy Maher Migden Shelley	Ayes: Supervisors Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Kaufman Kennedy Migden Shelley
Absent: Supervisor Achtenberg	Absent: Supervisors Achtenberg Hsieh Maher

I hereby certify that the foregoing ordinance was finally passed by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco

Jean L. Fum

Acting Clerk

File No. 27-93-7

MAY 25 1993

Date Approved

Frank M. Jordan

Mayor

DOCUMENTS DEPT.
JUN 3 1993
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

FILE NO.

(AIRPORT - SERVICE CONTRACT)

APPROVING THE "FOREIGN CURRENCY EXCHANGE LEASE" BETWEEN TELE-TRIP COMPANY, INC. AND THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, ACTING BY THE THROUGH ITS AIRPORTS COMMISSION.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1: Pursuant to Section 7.402-1 of the Charter, the Board of Supervisors hereby approves the "Foreign Currency Exchange Lease" between Tele-Trip Company, Inc. and the City and County of San Francisco, acting by the through its Airports Commission. The award of the Foreign Currency Exchange Lease to Tele-Trip Company, Inc. was approved by Airports Commission Resolution No. 93-0060, adopted April 6, 1993.

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

LOUISE H. RENNE
City Attorney

By _____
Deputy City Attorney

Airports Commission

Board of Supervisors, San Francisco

Passed for Second Reading	Finally Passed
May 10, 1993	May 17, 1993
Ayes: Supervisors Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Kennedy Maher Migden Shelley	Ayes: Supervisors Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Kaufman Kennedy Migden Shelley
Absent: Supervisor Achtenberg	Absent: Supervisors Achtenberg Hsieh Maher

I hereby certify that the foregoing ordinance was finally passed by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco

_____
Acting Clerk

MAY 25 1993

File No.
27-93-8

_____
Date Approved

_____
Mayor

DOCUMENTS DEPT.
JUN 3 1993
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

FILE NO. 45-93-20 ORDINANCE NO. 141-93

RO #92244

[CCP §998 OFFER OF SETTLEMENT OF LAWSUIT]

AUTHORIZING CCP §998 OFFER OF SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION OF KAI ALI AND KEVIN SMITH AGAINST CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, ET AL.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section I. The City Attorney is hereby authorized to make a CCP §998 offer to settle the action, including all attorneys' fees and costs, entitled "Ali, et al. v. City and County of San Francisco, et al," San Francisco Superior Court No. 941 911 by the payment of Thirty Thousand Dollars ($30,000).

APPROVED AS TO FORM AND RECOMMENDED:

LOUISE H. RENNE
City Attorney

PATRICK J. MAHONEY
Chief Trial Deputy

RECOMMENDED:

SAN FRANCISCO FIRE DEPARTMENT

JOSEPH MEDINA
Chief of the Department

FUNDS AVAILABLE:

EDWARD M. HARRINGTON
Controller

APR 29 1993

01 001 97 09 31
309773 1450 $30,000.00

APPROVED:

SAN FRANCISCO FIRE COMMISSION

RAYMOND G. CONNORS, JR.
Secretary

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Board of Supervisors, San Francisco

Passed for Second Reading	Finally Passed
May 10, 1993	May 17, 1993
Ayes: Supervisors Alioto, Bierman, Conroy, Hallinan, Hsieh, Kaufman, Kennedy, Maher, Migden	Ayes: Supervisors Alioto, Bierman Conroy, Hallinan, Kaufman Kennedy, Migden Shelley
Absent: Supervisors Achtenberg Shelley	Absent: Supervisors Achtenberg Hsieh, Maher

I hereby certify that the foregoing ordinance was finally passed by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco

MAY 25 1993

Acting Clerk

Date Approved

Mayor

File
45-93-20

DOCUMENTS DEPT
JUN 3 1993
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

File No. 45-93-21 Ordinance No. 142-93

RO#92242

AUTHORIZING SETTLEMENT OF APPELLATE ATTORNEYS' FEES LITIGATION IN STONE, et al., v. CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, ET AL.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section I. The City Attorney is hereby authorized to settle the litigation over the attorneys' fees currently before the United States Court of Appeal for the Ninth Circuit and entitled "STONE, ET AL., v. CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, et al.", United States Court of Appeal No. 91-16927 for the amount of $133,282.

APPROVED AS TO FORM AND RECOMMENDED:

LOUISE H. RENNE
City Attorney

DENNIS AFTERGUT
Chief Assistant City Attorney

RECOMMENDED:

SAN FRANCISCO SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT

MICHAEL HENNESSEY, SHERIFF

FUNDS AVAILABLE

EDWARD HARRINGTON, CONTROLLER

01 001 97 09 06
309740 1450 $133,282.00

APR 27 1993

3600G/68

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Board of Supervisors, San Francisco

Passed for Second Reading	Finally Passed
May 10, 1993	May 17, 1993
Ayes: Supervisors Alioto, Bierman, Conroy, Hallinan, Hsieh, Kaufman, Kennedy, Maher, Migden	Ayes: Supervisors Alioto, Bierman Conroy, Hallinan, Kaufman Kennedy, Migden Shelley
Absent: Supervisors Achtenberg Shelley	Absent: Supervisors Achtenberg Hsieh, Maher

I hereby certify that the foregoing ordinance was finally passed by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco

MAY 25 1993

Acting Clerk

File

Date Approved

Mayor

45-93-21

DOCUMENTS DEPT
JUN 3 1993
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

FILE NO. 45-93-22 ORDINANCE NO. 143-93

RO #92239

[SETTLEMENT OF LAWSUIT]

AUTHORIZING SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION OF MARY HOBDY AGAINST THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO for $75,000.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section I. The City Attorney is hereby authorized to settle the action entitled "MARY HOBDY v. CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, et al.," San Francisco Superior Court No. 934-909 , by the payment of $75,000.

APPROVED AS TO FORM AND RECOMMENDED:

LOUISE H. RENNE
City Attorney

PATRICK J. MAHONEY
Chief Trial Deputy

RECOMMENDED:

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH

RAYMOND J. BAXTER
Director

FUNDS AVAILABLE:

EDWARD M. HARRINGTON
Controller

01 001 97 09 86
309807 1450 $75,000.00
4606G

APPROVED:

PUBLIC HEALTH COMMISSION

Secretary

APR 22 1993

12/21/93

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Board of Supervisors, San Francisco

Passed for Second Reading
May 10, 1993

Ayes: Supervisors Alioto, Bierman, Conroy, Hallinan, Hsieh, Kaufman, Kennedy, Maher, Migden

Absent: Supervisors Achtenberg Shelley

Finally Passed
May 17, 1993

Ayes: Supervisors Alioto, Bierman Conroy, Hallinan, Kaufman Kennedy, Migden Shelley

Absent: Supervisors Achtenberg Hsieh, Maher

I hereby certify that the foregoing ordinance was finally passed by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco

Acting Clerk

MAY 25 1993

Date Approved

Mayor

File
45-93-22

DOCS DEPT.
JUN 3 1993
LIBRARY

FILE NO. 46-93-6 ORDINANCE NO. 144-93

SETTLEMENT OF LAWSUIT)

AUTHORIZING SETTLEMENT OF STELLA SANTOS, ET AL., v. WILLIAM G. LAI, ET AL., UPON RECEIPT OF $15,000.00 AND DISMISSAL OF COMPLAINT.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. The City Attorney is hereby authorized and directed to settle San Francisco Superior Court Action No. 939731 entitled "Stella Santos, Plaintiff, v. William G. Lai, et al., Defendants," by acceptance of $15,000.00 and by dismissing Complaint.

Section 2. Upon receipt of said sum of $15,000.00 and appropriate paperwork the City Attorney is authorized to dismiss said action.

APPROVED AND RECOMMENDED:

LOUISE H. RENNE
City Attorney

By Patrick J. Mahoney
PATRICK J. MAHONEY
Chief Trial Deputy

RECOMMENDED:

RETIREMENT BOARD
SAN FRANCISCO CITY AND COUNTY
EMPLOYEES' RETIREMENT SYSTEM

By Clare M. Murphy
CLARE M. MURPHY
General Manager

33184/24

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Board of Supervisors, San Francisco

Passed for Second Reading
May 10, 1993

Ayes: Supervisors Alioto, Bierman, Conroy, Hallinan, Hsieh, Kaufman, Kennedy, Maher, Migden

Absent: Supervisors Achtenberg Shelley

Finally Passed
May 17, 1993

Ayes: Supervisors Alioto, Bierman Conroy, Hallinan, Kaufman Kennedy, Migden Shelley

Absent: Supervisors Achtenberg Hsieh, Maher

I hereby certify that the foregoing ordinance was finally passed by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco

Jean Lum
Acting Clerk

MAY 25 1993
Date Approved

Frank M. Jordan
Mayor

File.
46-93-6

DOCUMENTS DEPT.
JUN 3 1993
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

May 5, 1993.

FILE NO. 65-93-4 ORDINANCE NO. 145-93

(Lease of General Clinical Research Space)

1r
/5

AUTHORIZING AND APPROVING retroactive to October 1, 1992, LEASE OF A PORTION OF THE THIRD FLOOR OF BUILDING 100 AND FIFTH FLOOR OF THE NEW HOSPITAL AT SAN FRANCISCO GENERAL HOSPITAL TO THE REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA.

Be It Ordained By The People of the City and County of San Francisco:

SECTION 1. The Board of Supervisors hereby finds that the University of California, through its School of Medicine, and the San Francisco General Hospital have cooperated closely for many years in providing professional staffing for the hospital and in the active conduct of medical research; that the cooperative efforts should be continued; and that the Regents of the University of California currently operate such research space in Building 100 providing staffing, equipment and materials for such use at no cost to the City and County of San Francisco; and that hospital code compliance necessitates relocation of a portion of the facilities within the Hospital; now therefore,

SECTION 2. The Board of Supervisors hereby finds that the leasing of approximately 7,635 square feet of space on the third floor of Building 100 and fifth floor of the New Hospital at San Francisco General Hospital with the Regents of the University of California for general clinical research space is for a public purpose and will promote the general welfare of the community.

SECTION 3. The Director of Property, the Director of Public Health and the Executive Administrator of the San Francisco General Hospital are authorized and directed to arrange a lease of said facilities with the University with said lease being for a period of ten (10) years at a monthly rental and utility charge of $8,940.58 for the first year and with the provision that the rent and utility charge will be adjusted annually and readjusted to the fair market rent after the first five (5) years of the lease and that the improvements made to the structure by the University will become the property of the City upon the termination of the lease and said lease being subject to the terms and conditions of the lease captioned "Lease Agreement" on file with the Clerk of the Board. Said lease shall be retroactive to October 1, 1992.

SECTION 4. The Mayor and the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors, on behalf of the City and County of San Francisco, be and they are hereby authorized and directed to execute said lease.

RECOMMENDED:

Director of Property

RECOMMENDED:

S.F. General Hospital
Executive Administrator

Director of Public Health

S.F. Health Commission

By

APPROVED AS TO FORM:
LOUISE H. RENNE, City Attorney

By
Deputy City Attorney

CD:A:\OCRC ORD
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

DOCUMENTS DEPT
JUN 3 1993
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

Board of Supervisors, San Francisco

Passed for Second Reading	Finally Passed
May 10, 1993	May 17, 1993
Ayes: Supervisors Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Kennedy Maher Migden Shelley	Ayes: Supervisors Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Kaufman Kennedy Migden Shelley
Absent: Supervisor Achtenberg	Absent: Supervisors Achtenberg Hsieh Maher

I hereby certify that the foregoing ordinance was finally passed by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco

Jean Lem
Acting Clerk

File No.
65-93-4

MAY 25 1993
Date Approved

Frank M. Jordan
Mayor

FILE NO. 86-93-1 ORDINANCE NO. 146-93

(SAN FRANCISCO COUNTY FAIR/FLOWER SHOW)

mlr
5/3

APPROVING AN AGREEMENT TO CONDUCT THE SAN FRANCISCO COUNTY FAIR/~~FLOWER~~ FLOWER SHOW FOR THE YEARS 1994, 1995 AND 1996 IN THE SAN FRANCISCO COUNTY FAIR BUILDING AND GROUNDS LOCATED IN GOLDEN GATE PARK, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. That certain agreement between the Recreation and Park Commission, for and on behalf of the City and County of San Francisco, and San Frnacisco Flower Show, Inc., to manage the 1994, 1995 and 1996 County Fair in the San Francisco County Fair Building and Grounds, a copy of which agreement is on file in the office of the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors and to which reference is hereby made, is hereby approved.

RECOMMENDED:

Mary E. Burns, General Manager
Recreation and Park Department

Shauna Marie Rose, Secretary
Recreation and Park Commission

APPROVED AS TO FORM:
Louise M. Renne, City Attorney

Scott Emblidge, Deputy City Attorney

795P

Board of Supervisors, San Francisco

Passed for Second Reading	Finally Passed
May 10, 1993	May 17, 1993
Ayes: Supervisors Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Kennedy Maher Migden Shelley	Ayes: Supervisors Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Kaufman Kennedy Migden Shelley
Absent: Supervisor Achtenberg	Absent: Supervisors Achtenberg Hsieh Maher

I hereby certify that the foregoing ordinance was finally passed by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco

Acting Clerk

MAY 25 1993

File No.
86-93-1

Date Approved

Mayor

DOCUMENTS DEPT.
JUN 3 1993
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

(Hold Harmless Agreements)

AMENDING CHAPTER 1 OF THE SAN FRANCISCO ADMINISTRATIVE CODE BY ADDING SECTION 1.25-7 THERETO, REGARDING HOLD HARMLESS AGREEMENTS WITH LICENSEES, PERMITTEES, AND OTHERS AT SAN FRANCISCO CONVENTION FACILITIES PERTAINING TO COMPLIANCE WITH THE AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT AND REQUIRING APPROVAL OF THE CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER AND THE CITY ATTORNEY FOR ANY MODIFICATION THERETO.

Note: This entire Section is new.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. Chapter 1 of the San Francisco Administrative Code is hereby amended, by adding Section 1.25-7 thereto to read as follows:

SEC. 1.25-7. HOLD HARMLESS AGREEMENTS PERTAINING TO COMPLIANCE WITH AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT.

(a) Any license, permit, contract or other agreement or any amendment thereto respecting the use of those facilities known as the San Francisco Convention Facilities, containing a hold harmless provision pertaining to compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. §12101 et seq.) or with any other federal, state or local law or regulation intended to provide equal accessibility for persons with disabilities, may be executed as required by law without approval by the Board of Supervisors, provided that said license, permit,

contract or other agreement or any amendment thereto contains substantially the following hold harmless provisions:

> Notwithstanding any other provision of this [license-permit-other], the City and County of San Francisco, primarily, and Spectacor Management Group and its successors and assigns ("Manager"), secondarily, agree to indemnify and hold harmless the [licensee-permittee-other] from any and all liability, claims, fines, penalties and reasonable attorneys' fees arising from any alleged failure of the physical structure, permanent improvements or permanent building access of the San Francisco Convention Facilities or from any temporary modification(s) to the physical structure or permanent building access, which may be necessary due to renovation, construction or repair of the San Francisco Convention Facilities, to comply with the requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. §12101 et seq.) and all other applicable federal, state and local laws and regulations intended to provide equal accessibility for persons with disabilities ("Disabilities Laws"), subject to the limitations below.

/ / /

/ / /

/ / /

DOCUMENTS DEPT
JUN 3 1993
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

Neither the City and County of San Francisco nor Manager will indemnify nor hold harmless any [licensee-permittee-other] against, and the [licensee-permittee-other] shall be solely responsible for, any liability, claim, fine, penalty or attorneys' fees arising from any failure by [licensee-permittee-other] to comply with any requirement of the Disabilities Laws relating to the non-permanent accessibility requirements of the Act, including but not limited to seating arrangement, auxiliary aids, set-up or organization by any exhibitor, decorator, agent or other representative of the [licensee-permittee-other] of any meeting room, display, exhibit, presentation or concession or for any liability, claim, fine, penalty or attorneys' fees other than those arising solely from any failure of the physical structures, permanent facilities or permanent building access of the San Francisco Convention Facilities to comply with the Disabilities Laws; except that [licensee-permitee-other] shall not be responsible for auxiliary facilities provided at [licensee-permittee-other]'s request which the City and County of San Francisco, through its Manager, has agreed in writing to provide for use in the San Francisco Convention Facilities to comply with the Disabilities Laws.

/ / /

[Licensee-Permittee-Other] agrees that it will use reasonable efforts in a timely manner to determine the needs and requirements of disabled persons who may be attending the event and in accordance with the rules and regulations promulgated by Manager, inform the Manager of the results of its efforts and of the accessibility services the [licensee-permittee-other] will provide to accomodate such disabled attendee(s) in compliance with the requirements of the Disabilities Laws.

Any modification to the hold harmless provision approved as set forth in this Section, which may hereafter be negotiated between the Manager and [licensee-permittee-other], shall require the written approval of the Chief Administrative Officer and of the City Attorney. Any [license-permit-other] entered into and any obligation incurred contrary to the provisions of this Section shall be void and any claim or demand against the City and County of San Francisco based thereon shall be invalid.

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

LOUISE H. RENNE,
City Attorney

By: _____
JULIA TEN EYCK
Deputy City Attorney

Board of Supervisors, San Francisco

Passed for Second Reading	Finally Passed
May 10, 1993	May 17, 1993
Ayes: Supervisors Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Kennedy Maher Migden Shelley	Ayes: Supervisors Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Kaufman Kennedy Migden Shelley
Absent: Supervisor Achtenberg	Absent: Supervisors Achtenberg Hsieh Maher

I hereby certify that the foregoing ordinance was finally passed by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco

Joan Lum
Acting Clerk

MAY 25 1993

Date Approved

Frank M. Jordan
Mayor

File No.
97-93-19

FILE NO. 97-93-20 ORDINANCE NO. 148-93

[REPRESENTATION OF CITY AND COUNTY IN CERTAIN ORGANIZATIONS - POLICE DEPARTMENT]

AMENDING CHAPTER 16 OF THE SAN FRANCISCO ADMINISTRATIVE CODE BY ADDING SECTION 16.6-47.1, THERETO, PERMITTING REPRESENTATION OF THE POLICE DEPARTMENT IN CERTAIN ORGANIZATIONS.

Note: The entire section is new.

Be it ordained by the people of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. The San Francisco Administrative Code is hereby amended by adding Section 16.6-47.1, thereof, to read as follows:

SEC. 16.6-47.1. REPRESENTATION OF CITY AND COUNTY IN CERTAIN ORGANIZATIONS - POLICE DEPARTMENT.

California Robbery Investigators Association
California Homicide Investigators Association
California Association of Criminalists
Association of Crime Laboratory Directors
American Board of Forensic Document Examiners
Southwestern Association of Forensic Document Examiners
American Academy of Forensic Science
National Association of Bunco Investigators
International Association of Credit Card Investigators
California Check Investigators Association
Law Enforcement Intelligence Unit
Northern California Hate Crimes Investigators Association

International Association of Asian Crime Investigators
California Narcotics Officers' Association
Western Intelligence Network
International Association of Chiefs of Police
National Association of Fleet Administrators
California Association for Property and Evidence
Computerized CLETS Users Group
California Academy & Directors Association
North American Transportation Regulators
International Association of Identification, California State Division
International Association of Bomb Technicians and Investigators
Police Executive Research Forum
Hispanic Command Officers Association
California Peace Officers Association
California Police Chiefs Association

DOCUMENTS DEPT.
JUN 3 1993
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

Board of Supervisors, San Francisco

Passed for Second Reading

May 10, 1993

Ayes: Supervisors Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Kennedy Maher Migden Shelley

Absent: Supervisor Achtenberg

Finally Passed

May 17, 1993

Ayes: Supervisors Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Kaufman Kennedy Migden Shelley

Absent: Supervisors Achtenberg Hsieh Maher

I hereby certify that the foregoing ordinance was finally passed by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco

Jean Lum
Acting Clerk

MAY 25 1993
Date Approved

Frank M. Jordan
Mayor

File No.
97-93-20

FILE NO. 97-93-21 ORDINANCE NO. 149-93

(ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW FEES)

AMENDING THE SAN FRANCISCO ADMINISTRATIVE CODE BY AMENDING SECTION 31.46A TO INCREASE FEES, ADD NEW FEES AND EXTEND THE OPERATIVE DATE THROUGH 1995 CONCERNING ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORTS AND NEGATIVE DECLARATIONS AND AMENDING SECTION 31.46 TO BE OPERATIVE JANUARY 1, 1996 CONCERNING FEES FOR ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW PROCEDURES.

NOTE: Additions are underlined; deletions are in double ((double parentheses)).

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code is hereby amended by amending Section 31.46A thereof to read as follows:

TEXT OF ARTICLE EFFECTIVE JULY 1, 1991 AND OPERATIVE THROUGH DECEMBER 31, ((1993)) 1995.

Sec. 31.46A. BASIC FEES

(a) The following basic fees shall be charged by the Department of City Planning, as specified in Section 31.45 above:

(1) For an initial evaluation of a project (Section 31.23) excluding use of special expertise or technical assistance, as described in Section 31.47 below, the fee shall be:

- where the total estimated construction cost as defined by the San Francisco Building Code is less than $10,000 ..... (($300)) $950;
- where said total estimated construction cost is

$10,000 or more, but less than $200,000 ..... (($300)) $950 PLUS ((.3%)) .41% of the cost over $10,000;
- where said total estimated construction cost is $200,000 or more, but less than $1,000,000 .....(($870)) $1,730 PLUS ((.23%)) .31% of the cost over $200,000;
- where said total estimated construction cost is $1,000,000 or more, but less than $10,000,000 ....(($2,710)) $4,248 PLUS ((.19%)) .26% of the cost over $1,000,000;
- where said total estimated construction cost is $10,000,000 or more, but less than $30,000,000 ..... (($19,810)) $27,647 PLUS ((.06%)) .08% of the cost over $10,000,000;
- where said total estimated construction cost is $30,000,000 or more, but less than $50,000,000 ..... (($31,810)) $44,067 PLUS ((.02%)) .03% of the cost over $30,000,000;
- where said total estimated construction cost is $50,000,000 or more, but less than $100,000,000 ..... (($ 35,810)) $49,540 PLUS ((.006%)) .007% of the cost over $50,000,000;
- where said total estimated construction cost is $100,000,000 or more ..... (($38,810)) $53,189

DOCUMENTS DEPT.
JUN 3 1993
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

PLUS ((.002%)) .003% of the cost over $100,000,000.

- where there is no construction cost ..... $950 plus time and materials in excess of that fee.

(2) For preparation of an environmental impact report (Sections 31.26 - 31.28) excluding use of special expertise or technical assistance, as described in Section 31.47 below the fee shall be:

- where the total estimated construction cost as defined in the San Francisco building Code is less than $200,000 ..... (($11,000)) $16,000. For each 200 hours of staff time or fraction thereof
- where said total estimated construction cost is $200,000 or more, but less than $1,000,000 ..... (($11,000)) $16,000 PLUS ((.28%)) .4% of the cost over $200,000
- where said total estimated construction cost is $1,000,000 or more, but less than $10,000,000 ..... (($13,240)) $19,187 PLUS ((.19%)) .27% OF THE COST OVER $1,000,000
- where said total estimate construction cost is $10,000,000 or more, but less than $30,000,000 ..... (($30,340)) $43,514 PLUS ((.075%)) .11% of the cost over $10,000,000

- where said total estimated construction cost is $30,000,000 or more, but less than $50,000,000 ..... (($45,340)) $64,854 PLUS ((.02%)) .03% of the cost over $30,000,000
- where said total construction cost is $50,000,000 or more, but less than $100,000,000 ..... (($49,340)) $70,328 PLUS ((.02%)) .03% of the cost over $50,000,000
- where said total estimate construction cost is $100,000,000 or more (($59,340)) $84,554 PLUS .01% of the cost over $100,000,000

(3) For an appeal to the City Planning Commission [Sections 31.14(b), 31.24(d), 31.25(b)]: the fee shall be (($75)) $200 to the appellant, and an additional fee shall be paid by the project sponsor based on the time and materials the Department expends in responding to the appeal; provided, however, that this additional fee shall not exceed the cost of the initial evaluation as set forth in paragraph 1 above.

(4) For a copy of an environmental impact report or other document, where this Chapter does not require the sending of that document to the person requesting it: the actual cost to the Department of City Planning of reproducing that copy.

(5) For preparation of an ((amendment)) addendum to an environmental impact report that has previously been certified,

pursuant to Section ((31.36)) 15164 of the State CEQA Guidelines: one third of the fee that would be required for a full environmental impact report on the same project, as set forth in paragraph 2 above((.)), plus time and materials for costs in excess of that amount.

(6) For preparation of a supplement to ((an)) a draft or certified final environmental impact report ((that has not previously been certified)): one ((third)) half of the fee that would be required for a full environmental impact report on the same project, as set forth in paragraph 2 above((.)), plus time and materials for costs incurred in excess of that amount.

(7) For preparation of a ((supplement to an)) subsequent environmental impact report ((that has previously been certified)): two thirds of the fee that would be required for a full environmental impact report on the same project, as set forth in paragraph 2 above.

(8) For reevaluation of a modified project for which a negative declaration has been prepared, pursuant to Section 31.35 (a) and (c), one-third of the fee that would be required for an initial evaluation as shown in paragraph 1 above, plus time and materials for any costs incurred in excess of that amount, when the reevaluation results in a determination that no new environmental document must be prepared.

(9) (((8))) For preparation of a Certificate of Exemption from Environmental Review: ((($100)) $150.

(10) (((9))) For preparation of a Letter of Exemption From Environmental Review: ((($50)) $75.

(11) (((10))) For any project which has the potential to create shadow impact on property protected under City Planning Code Section 295(a), and is subject to computer analysis: a minimum fee of $5,000, and an additional fee to cover the cost of any time and materials which the Department has expended in excess of $5,000.

(12) (((11))) For monitoring environmental mitigation measures which are imposed as conditions of approvals: cost of time and materials.

(b) Payment. The fee specified in Subsection (a) (1) shall be paid to the Department of City Planning at the time of the filing of the environmental evaluation application, and where an environmental impact report is determined to be required, the fee specified in Subsection (a) (2) shall be paid at the time the preliminary draft environmental impact report I (PDEIR I) is prepared, except as specified below. Any fraternal, charitable, benevolent or any other non-profit organization, which organization is exempt from taxation under the Internal Revenue laws of the United States and the Revenue and Taxation Code of the Sate of California as a bona fide fraternal, charitable, benevolent or other non-profit organization, may defer payment of the fees specified in Subsections (a) (1) and (a) (2) to the time of issuance of the building permit, before the building permit is

released to the applicant; provided that the application is for the development of residential units all of which units are affordable to low and moderate households, as defined in the Guidelines of the United States Housing and Urban Development Department, for a period of 20 years, which exemption shall apply notwithstanding the inclusion in the development of other non-profit ancillary or accessory uses.

An exemption from paying the full fees specified under Section 31.46A(a)3 may be granted when the appellant's income is not enough to pay the fee without affecting their abilities to pay for the necessities of life, provided that the person seeking the exemption demonstrates to the Zoning Administrator that they are substantially affected by the proposed project.

(c) Refunds. When a request for an initial evaluation or for preparation of an environmental impact report is (1) either withdrawn by the applicant or deemed canceled by the Department of City Planning due to inactivity on the part of the applicant, and (2) the Environmental Review Officer determines that no substantial costs have been incurred by the Department in acting on the request (for example, no activity has occurred beyond initial scoping meetings) then the applicant shall be entitled to a refund of 75% of the fees paid to the Department.

(d) Temporary Surcharge On Environmental Review Fees.

(1) For each basic fee listed in Section 31.46A

subsections (a)(1), (7), (8) and (((11))) (12) above, ((a two and one-half)) an eight percent surcharge shall be added to the filing fee to enable the Department of City Planning to recover the initial costs incurred by the Department in developing and implementing the hardware and software systems required to computerize activities associated with the Department's processing of permit applications. This surcharge shall remain in effect until June 30, ((1993))1994.

(((2) For each basic fee listed in Section 31.46 subsections (a)(1), (7), (8) and (11) above, a four and nine-tenths percent surcharge shall be added to the filing fee to enable the Department of City Planning to recover those costs incurred by the Department in computerizing activities associated with its processing of permit applications, including the costs of a consultant, property information database development and other time and materials costs unrelated to the hardware and software systems referred to in subsection (1) above. This surcharge shall remain in effect through June 30, 1993.

(e) Fee For Maintaining And Updating Permit Processing Computer System. For each basic fee listed in Section 31.46 subsections (a)(1), (7), (8) and (11) above, the Department of City Planning shall charge and collect at the time of filing of the application an additional fee of eight and six-tenths and four-tenths percent of the original fee in order to compensate the Department of City Planning for the costs directly related to

5/10/93
ejp

maintaining its permit processing computer system and for updating the property information data base used by the Department in activities associated with processing permit applications.))

e(((f))) Fee For Zoning and Public Information, and Construction Services Related to Development Projects and Permit Processing. For the basic fee in Section 31.46A Subsection (a)(1) above, the Department of City Planning shall charge and collect at the time of filing of the application an additional fee of $125.00 in order to compensate the Department of City Planning for zoning and public information, and construction services, related to development projects and permit processing.))

(f) (((g))) Period Section is Operative. This Section is effective July 1, 1991 and operative through December 31, ((1993)) 1995. This Section is repealed as of January 1, ((1994)) 1996, unless a later enacted ordinance extends the operative period.

(g) (((h))) These amendments to fees related to the Department of City Planning are intended to provide revenues for the increased staffing and other support necessary to provide more timely processing of applications within that Department.

The City Planning Commission shall conduct ((a)) public hearings at the end of Fiscal Year 1992-1993, Fiscal Year 1993-94, and Fiscal Year 1994-95 to review the level of service

provided by the Department of City Planning in providing improved application processing as contemplated under this ordinance. The Commission shall determine ((at that time)) at its public hearing at the end of Fiscal Year 1994-95 whether to initiate an ordinance to extend or to otherwise modify those amendments to fees related to the Department of City Planning that are contained within this ordinance. The Commission shall provide a report and appropriate recommendations to the Board of Supervisors within one month of the close of its public hearing.

Section 2. Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code is hereby amended by amending Section 31.46 thereof to read as follows:

TEXT OF ARTICLE OPERATIVE JANUARY 1, ((1994)) 1996.

Sec. 31.46. BASIC FEES

(a) Fees. The following basic fees shall be charged by the Department of City Planning, as specified in Section 31.45 above:

(1) For an initial evaluation of a project (Section 31.23) excluding use of special expertise or technical assistance, as described in Section 31.47 below, the fee shall be:

- where the total estimated construction cost as defined by the San Francisco Building Code is less than $10,000 ..... $160;
- where said total estimated construction cost is

$10,000 or more, but less than $1,000,000 ..... $160 PLUS .17% of the cost over $10,000;

- where said total estimated construction cost is $1,000,000 or more, but less than $10,000,000 ..... $1,843 PLUS .11% of the cost over $1,000,000;
- where said total estimated construction cost is $10,000,000 or more, but less than $30,000,000 ..... $11,743 PLUS .035% of the cost over $10,000,000;
- where said total estimated construction cost is $30,000,000 or more, but less than $50,000,000 ..... $18,743 PLUS .02% of the cost over $30,000,000;
- where said total estimated construction cost is $50,000,000 or more, but less than $100,000,000 ..... $22,743 PLUS .006% of the cost over $50,000,000;
- where said total estimated construction cost is $100,000,000 or more $25,743 PLUS .002% of the cost over $100,000,000.

(2) For preparation of an environmental impact report (Sections 31.26 - 31.28) excluding use of special expertise or technical assistance, as described in Section 31.47 below the fee shall be:

- where the total estimated construction cost as defined in the San Francisco Building Code is less than $200,000 ..... $7,000 for each 200 hours of staff time or fraction thereof
- where said total estimated construction cost is $200,000 or more, but less than $1,000,000 ..... $7,000 PLUS .15% of the cost over $200,000
- where said total estimated construction cost is $1,000,000 or more, but less than $10,000,000 ..... $8,200 PLUS .11% of the cost over $1,000,000
- where said total estimated construction cost is $10,000,000 or more, but less than $30,000,000 ..... $18,100 PLUS .05% of the cost over $10,000,000
- where said total estimated construction cost is $30,000,000 or more, but less than $50,000,000 ..... $28,100 PLUS .02% of the cost over $30,000,000
- where said total construction cost is $50,000,000 or more, but less than $100,000,000 ..... $32,100 PLUS .02% of the cost over $50,000,000
- where said total estimated construction cost is $100,000,000 or more $42,100 PLUS .01% of the cost over $100,000,000

(3) For an appeal to the City Planning Commission [Sections 31.14(b), 31.24(d), 31.25(b)]: the fee shall be $75 to the appellant, and an additional fee shall be paid by the project sponsor based on the time and materials the Department expends in responding to the appeal; provided, however, that this additional fee shall not exceed the cost of the initial evaluation as set forth in Paragraph 1 above.

(4) For a copy of an environmental impact report or other document, where this Chapter does not require the sending of that document to the person requesting it: the actual cost to the Department of City Planning of reproducing that copy.

(5) For preparation of an amendment to an environmental impact report that has previously been certified, pursuant to Section 31.36: 1/3 (one-third) of the fee that would be required for a full environmental impact report on the same project, as set forth in Paragraph 2 above.

(6) For preparation of a supplement to an environmental impact report that has not previously been certified: 1/3 of the fee that would be required for a full environmental impact report on the same project, as set forth in Paragraph 2 above.

(7) For preparation of a supplement to an environmental impact report that has previously been certified: 2/3 of the fee that would be required for a full environmental impact report on the same project, as set forth in Paragraph 2 above.

(8) For preparation of a Certificate of Exemption from

Environmental Review: $100.

(9) For any project which has the potential to create shadow impact on property protected under City Planning Code Section 295(a), and is subject to computer analysis: a minimum fee of $5,000, and an additional fee to cover the cost of any time and materials which the Department has expended in excess of $5,000.

(b) Exemption. Any fraternal, charitable, benevolent or any other non-profit organization having a regular membership associated primarily for civic welfare, with revenue accruing therefrom to be used exclusively for the non-profit purpose of said organization, and which organization is exempt from taxation under the Internal Revenue laws of the United States as a bona fide fraternal, charitable, benevolent or other non-profit organization, shall be exempt from paying the fees specified in Subsections (a)(1) and (a)(2) above.

(c) Refunds. When a request for an initial evaluation or for preparation of an environmental impact report is (1) either withdrawn by the applicant or deemed canceled by the Department of City Planning due to inactivity on the part of the applicant, and (2) the Environmental Review Officer determines that no substantial costs have been incurred by the Department in acting on the request (for example, no activity has occurred beyond initial scoping meetings) then the applicant shall be entitled to a refund of 75 percent of the fees paid to the Department.

(d) This Article shall become operative on January 1, ((1994)) 1996.

APPROVED AS TO FORM
LOUISE H. RENNE, City Attorney

By Judith A. Boggion
Deputy City Attorney

G:\BIRPERS\peg

Board of Supervisors, San Francisco

Passed for Second Reading	Finally Passed
May 10, 1993	May 17, 1993
Ayes: Supervisors Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Kennedy Maher Migden Shelley	Ayes: Supervisors Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Kaufman Kennedy Maher Migden Shelley
Absent: Supervisor Achtenberg	Absent: Supervisors Achtenberg Hsieh

I hereby certify that the foregoing ordinance was finally passed by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco

Jean Lum
Acting Clerk

File No.
97-93-21

MAY 25 1993
Date Approved

Frank M. Jordan
Mayor

(FEE SURCHARGE)

AMENDING THE SAN FRANCISCO ADMINISTRATIVE CODE BY AMENDING CHAPTER 10F.1 CONCERNING THE SURCHARGE TO RECOVER COSTS FOR ACQUIRING OFFICE SPACE AT 1660 MISSION STREET, FOR SECTION NUMBERS TO CONFORM TO NEW LEGISLATION.

Note: Additions are underlined; deletions are in ((double parentheses)).

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. Chapter 10F.1 of the San Francisco Administrative Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

SEC.10F.1. FEE SURCHARGE. At the time a fee is collected, a surcharge not to exceed: (1) 3 percent for the period commencing July 1, 1993 through June 30, 1995, (2) 4.5 percent for the period commencing July 1, 1995 through June 30, 2000, and (3) 6.5 percent for the period commencing July 1, 2000 through June 30, 2005, shall be charged and collected for the following categories of fees:

(a) San Francisco Fire Code Section 4.208 (Plan Review Fees);

(b) San Francisco Building Code Section 330.1, excepting Strong Motion Instrumentation Fee; Sections 330.2 through 330.4 ; 331; 332; 332.1 through 332.3; 332.5; 333.1 through 333.3;

(c) San Francisco Public Works Code Sections 708.2; 716; 724.1; 724.8 and 725.3;

////

(d) San Francisco Planning Code Sections 351(a) through ((366, 369 and 371)) (d) and (f) through (l), and 352 through 357 of Article 3.5A or San Francisco Planning Code Sections 351 through 364 of Article 3.5, whichever is in effect;

(e) San Francisco Administrative Code Sections 8.28; 31.47; and Sections 31.46A(a)(1) through (12) (((11))) and 31.46A(e)(((f))), or 31.46(a)(1) through (9), whichever is in effect.

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

LOUISE H. RENNE
City Attorney

By Judith A. Bazajian
Deputy City Attorney

U:\PBG\WP51\PEB91660

DOCUMENTS DEPT
JUN 3 1993
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

Board of Supervisors, San Francisco

Passed for Second Reading	Finally Passed
May 10, 1993	May 17, 1993
Ayes: Supervisors Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Kennedy Maher Migden Shelley	Ayes: Supervisors Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Kaufman Kennedy Migden Shelley
Absent: Supervisor Achtenberg	Absent: Supervisors Achtenberg Hsieh Maher

I hereby certify that the foregoing ordinance was finally passed by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco

MAY 25 1993

Jean Lum
Acting Clerk

File No.
97-93-22

Date Approved

Frank M. Jordan
Mayor

As amended in committee
5/5/93

FILE NO. 101-92-60

ORDINANCE NO. 151-93

(Government Funding)

RO# 92192 SA# 69

kg 5/5/93

APPROPRIATING ~~$15,307,533~~ $15,204,533 FOR VARIOUS CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS, FIRE DEPARTMENT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1992 - 93; placing $10,788,125 on reserve.

Be it ordained by the people of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. FUNDS ARE HEREBY APPROPRIATED FOR FY 1992-93 AS FOLLOWS:

Department and Number	Source of Funds and Purpose of Appropriation	Amount Debit	Amount Credit
05 - 623	1992 Prop C Bond Issue Fund		
31 - 00 - 00	Fire Department		
55-5500 (057968)	Proceeds - Sale of Bonds	~~$15,307,533~~ 15,204,533	
Project 510 - 01	Design and Architectural		
20-2030 (530170)	Capital Improvement Project		$14,557,443
Project 515 - 01	Project Management and Control		
20-2030 (530170)	Capital Improvement Project		420,000
Project 520 - 01	SFFD Administration for the Project		
20-2030 (530170)	Capital Improvement Project		117,090
Project 525 - 01	SFFD Disruption Expenses		
20-2030 (530170)	Capital Improvement Project		100,000
Project 530 - 01	Services of Real Estate		
20-2030 (530170)	Capital Improvement Project		10,000
Project 535 - 01	Cost of Bond Issues - CAO		
20-2030 (530170)	Capital Improvement Project		~~37,260~~
Project	Legal Services - City Attorney		
20-2030 (530170)	Capital Improvement Project		~~95,740~~
	Total	~~$15,307,533~~ $15,204,533	~~$15,307,533~~ $15,204,533

kg 5/5/93

kg 5/5/93

Section. 2. Funds in the amount of $10,788,125 including $379,300 for FCM Capital improvements pending selection of improvements to be made at Fire Stations and $10,408,825 pending selection of contractors and determination of cost details and MBE/WBE status of contractors are hereby placed on reserve, to be released by the Budget Committee.

APPROVED AS TO FORM:
LOUISE H. RENNE, CITY ATTORNEY

BY: [signature]
DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY

FUNDS AVAILABLE:

[signature]
CONTROLLER

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

DOCUMENTS DEPT.
JUN 3 1993
SAN FRANCISCO

Board of Supervisors, San Francisco

Passed for Second Reading	Finally Passed
May 10, 1993	May 17, 1993
Ayes: Supervisors Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Kennedy Maher Migden Shelley	Ayes: Supervisors Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Kaufman Kennedy Migden Shelley
Absent: Supervisor Achtenberg	Absent: Supervisors Achtenberg Hsieh Maher

I hereby certify that the foregoing ordinance was finally passed by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco

Jean Lum
Acting Clerk

File No.
101-92-60

MAY 25 1993
Date Approved

Frank M Jordan
Mayor

FILE NO. 101-92-66.2 ORDINANCE NO. 152-93

(Government Funding) RO# 92246 SA# 118

APPROPRIATING 120,000 FOR PROGRAM PROJECT BUDGET (SPECIAL ELECTION FUND), REGISTRAR OF VOTERS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1992 - 93.

Be it ordained by the people of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. FUNDS ARE HEREBY APPROPRIATED FOR FY 1992-93 AS FOLLOWS:

Department and Number	Source of Funds and Purpose of Appropriation	Amount Debit	Amount Credit
01 - 001	**General Fund**		
99 - 00 - 00	General Fund Unallocated		
GL 155 (119990)	Interfund Receivable		
Subsidiary 000078	SFUSD - Special Election Advance	$120,000	
80 - 00 - 00	**Registrar of Voters**		
Project 037 - 01	Special Election Fund		
20-2010 (430025)	Program Project Budget		$120,000

APPROVED AS TO FORM:
LOUISE H. RENNE, CITY ATTORNEY

BY: [signature]
DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY

FUNDS AVAILABLE:

[signature]
CONTROLLER

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Board of Supervisors, San Francisco

Passed for Second Reading
May 10, 1993
Ayes: Supervisors Alioto, Bierman, Conroy, Hallinan, Hsieh, Kaufman, Kennedy, Maher, Migden
Absent: Supervisors Achtenberg Shelley

Finally Passed
May 17, 1993
Ayes: Supervisors Alioto, Bierman Conroy, Hallinan, Kaufman Kennedy, Migden Shelley
Absent: Supervisors Achtenberg Hsieh, Maher

I hereby certify that the foregoing ordinance was finally passed by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco

[signature]
Acting Clerk

MAY 25 1993
Date Approved

[signature]
Mayor

File
101-92-66.2

DOCUMENTS DEPT
JUN 3 1993

FILE NO. 115-93-4 ORDINANCE NO. 153-93

PLANNING FEES)

AMENDING PART II, CHAPTER II, OF THE SAN FRANCISCO MUNICIPAL CODE (CITY PLANNING CODE) BY REPEALING EXISTING ARTICLE 3.5A AND ENACTING NEW ARTICLE 3.5A TO REORGANIZE THE ARTICLE, IMPOSE NEW FEES, CHANGE THE AMOUNT OF FEES CURRENTLY CHARGED RELATING TO DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING ACTIONS, ACTIVITIES AND SERVICES AND EXTEND THE OPERATIVE DATE THROUGH 1995, AND BY AMENDING ARTICLE 3.5 TO BE OPERATIVE JANUARY 1, 1996 CONCERNING PLANNING CODE FEES.

NOTE: Additions are <u>underlined</u>; deletions are in ((double parentheses))

Be it ordained by the people of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. Part II, Chapter II, Article 3.5A of the San Francisco Municipal Code (City Planning Code) is hereby repealed:

((ARTICLE 3.5A

FEES

Sec. 350. FEES, GENERAL. In order to compensate the Department of City Planning for the cost of processing permit applications for the establishment, abolition or modification of a setback line, for signs, demolition, reclassification of property, conditional use authorization, granting of an exemption, variance, or coastal zone permit, reviewing permit applications filed in and issued by other City departments, institutional master plans, Master Plan amendments and referrals, projects which require review under

Section 295 of this Code (park shadow ordinance) and permits requiring additional review by nature of their location within the C-3 District, providing Zoning Certifications, Research, Document Retrieval and Technical Reports in order to compensate the Department of City Planning for the costs relating to computerization of records and processes, hazardous waste facilities review, and collection of fees that are in arrears, and to enable collection of delinquent accounts, fees shall be charged and collected as indicated for each class of application, permit, filing request or activity listed in Section 351 through 371 below.

Sec. 351. FEES FOR APPLICATIONS TO ESTABLISH, ABOLISH OR MODIFY A SETBACK LINE, TO RECLASSIFY PROPERTY, TO AUTHORIZE A CONDITIONAL USE, TO CONSIDER A VARIANCE, OR TO REVIEW A COASTAL ZONE PERMIT. Except as provided in subsection (e) below, the Department of City Planning shall charge and collect a fee before accepting any of the following applications for filing:

(a) For each application to establish, abolish or modify a setback line, the fee shall be $500 for each block frontage, or portion thereof, affected by the proposed application.

(b) For each application to reclassify property or impose interim zoning controls, the fee shall be, Assessor's Block or

Portion Thereof	Fee
1	$ 1,000
2	$ 1,250
3	$ 1,500

DOCUMENTS DEPT.
JUN 3 1993
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

4	$ 1,750
5	$ 2,000
6	$ 2,250
7	$ 2,500
8	$ 2,750
9	$ 3,000
10 or more	$3,250 plus $250 per block or portion thereof.

(c) For each application to authorize a conditional use pursuant to Section 303 of this Code, including a planned unit development under Section 304 of this Code, or a Coastal Zone Permit under Section 330, the fee shall be:

(1) Where the total estimated construction cost as defined by the San Francisco Building Code is less than $10,000, $325;

(2) Where said total estimated construction cost is $10,000 or more, but less than $1,000,000, $410 plus .285% of the cost over $10,000;

(3) Where said total estimated construction cost is $1,000,000 or more, but less than $5,000,000, $3,232 plus .33% of the cost over $1,000,000;

(4) Where said total estimated construction cost is $5,000,000 or more, but less than $10,000,000, $16,432 plus .285% of the cost over $5,000,000;

(5) Where said total estimated construction cost is $10,000,000

\\

or more, but less than $30,000,000, $30,682 plus .146% of the cost over $10,000,000;

(6) Where said total estimated construction cost is $30,000,000 or more, but less than $50,000,000, $59,882 plus .09% of the cost over $30,000,000;

(7) Where said total estimated construction cost is $50,000,000 or more, but less than $100,000,000, $77,882 plus .06% of the cost over $50,000,000;

(8) Where said total estimated construction cost is $100,000,000 or more, $107,882 plus .016% of the cost over $100,000,000.

Where an applicant requests both a conditional use authorization and coastal zone permit review, the amount of the conditional use fee shall be reduced by 50 percent.

(d) For each application to authorize a variance pursuant to Section 305 of this Code, the fee shall be:

(1) Where the total estimated construction cost as defined by the San Francisco Building Code is less than $10,000, $500;

(2) Where said total estimated construction cost is $10,000 or more, but less than $1,000,000, $500 plus .28% of the cost over $10,000;

(3) Where said total estimated construction cost is $1,000,000 or more, but less than $5,000,000, $3,272 plus .34% of the cost over $1,000,000;

(4) Where said total estimated construction cost is $5,000,000

or more, but less than $10,000,000, $16,872 plus .28% of the cost over $5,000,000;

(5) Where said total estimated construction cost is $10,000,000 or more, but less than $30,000,000, $30,872 plus .15% of the cost over $10,000,000;

(6) Where said total estimated construction cost is $30,000,000 or more, but less than $50,000,000, $60,872 plus .09% of the cost over $30,000,000;

(7) Where said total estimated construction cost is $50,000,000 or more, but less than $100,000,000, $78,872 plus .06% of the cost over $50,000,000;

(8) Where said total estimated construction cost is $100,000,000 or more, $108,872 plus .016% of the cost over $100,000,000.

(e) Any fraternal, charitable, benevolent or any other non-profit organization, which organization is exempt from taxation under the Internal Revenue laws of the United States and the Revenue and Taxation Code of the State of California as a bona fide fraternal, charitable, benevolent or other non-profit organization, shall pay 75% of the fees specified in paragraphs (a) through (d) inclusive of this Section at the time of issuance of the building permit, as long as the fees are paid before the building permit is released to the applicant; provided that the application is for the development of residential units all of which are affordable to low and moderate income households, as defined in the Guidelines of the

United States Housing and Urban Development Department, for a period of 20 years, which exemption shall apply notwithstanding the inclusion in the development of other non-profit ancillary or accessory uses. Further, in the event that the Department of City Planning is provided information establishing that the City and County of San Francisco is contributing 50% or more of the financing for the project, but less than 75%, the fees paid by these non-profit organizations for such affordable housing developments shall be 50% of the specified fees, and provided further, if the Department determines that the City and County of San Francisco is contributing 75% or more of the financing for the project, the fee shall be waived. For the purposes of this paragraph, funds received by the City and County of San Francisco as entitlements under Federal or State Programs and San Francisco Redevelopment Agency funds shall be considered contributions of the City and County of San Francisco.

(f) Refunds. When an application is (1) either withdrawn by the applicant, or deemed cancelled by the Department of City Planning due to inactivity on the part of the applicant, and (2) the Zoning Administrator determines that no substantial costs have been incurred by the Department in acting on the application (for example, little time has been expended beyond initial scoping meetings), then the applicant shall be entitled to a refund of 75 percent of the fee paid to the Department.

Sec. 352. FEE FOR REVIEW OF BUILDING PERMIT APPLICATIONS. In

order to compensate the Department of City Planning for a part of the cost of the review of building permit applications for compliance with the City Planning Code, fees shall be charge and collected by the Central Permit Bureau, upon application for a permit for a new building, or a permit to change the use or alter the exterior of an existing building, as indicated below, in conjunction with current and existing fee collections:

(a) Where the total estimated construction cost as defined by the San Francisco Building Code is $10,000 or less, the fee shall be $60;

(b) Where said total estimated construction cost is more than $10,000, but less than $200,000, the fee shall be $60 plus .17% of the cost over $10,000;

(c) Where said total estimated construction cost is $200,000 or more, but less than $5,000,000, the fee shall be $383 plus .16% of the cost over $200,000;

(d) Where said total estimated construction cost is $5,000,000 or more, but less than $10,000,000, the fee shall be $8,063 plus .14% of the cost over $5,000,000;

(e) Where said total estimated construction cost is $10,000,000 or more, the fee shall be $15,063 plus .13% of the cost over $10,000,000.

In addition to the fees set forth above, there shall be the following additional fees, to be collected by the Central Permit Bureau, upon identification by the Department of City Planning:

(f) Where the building permit is for property within the C-3 (Downtown Commercial) District, an additional fee of $200 to cover costs of providing the notices required under Section 309(c) and (d) of this Code;

(g) Where the building permit involves new construction exceeding 40 feet in height as defined under this Code or an alteration to an existing building which changes any exterior dimensions of the building at an elevation exceeding 40 feet in height, an additional fee of $200 to cover costs to the Department of City Planning to determine if the project will cast any new shadows upon property pursuant to Section 295 of this Code.

(h) Where the building permit involves a site permit, and the construction cost is more than $350,000 or more than one addendum is filed, an additional fee of $250.

Sec. 353. FEE FOR BUILDING DEMOLITION APPLICATIONS. In order to compensate the Department of City Planning for a part of the cost of review of building permit applications for demolition, the fee shall be $200, to be collected by the Central Permit Bureau, at time of application.

Sec. 354. FEE FOR SIGN APPLICATIONS. In order to compensate the Department of City Planning for a part of the cost of the review of sign applications, the fee shall be $75, to be collected by the Central Permit Bureau, at time of application.

Sec. 355. FEE FOR REVIEW OF PERMIT APPLICATIONS ISSUED BY THE FIRE DEPARTMENT, THE POLICE DEPARTMENT AND THE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC

HEALTH. In order to compensate the Department of City Planning for a part of the cost of the review of permit applications under the jurisdiction of the Fire Department, the Police Department and the Department of Public Health, a fee of $40 shall be charged and collected by the other departments in conjunction with current and existing fee collections.

Sec. 356. FEE FOR FILING OF INSTITUTIONAL MASTER PLANS. In order to compensate the Department of City Planning for the cost of reviewing institutional master plans pursuant to Section 304.5 of this Code, the Department shall charge and collect a fee as follows:

(a) Where a full institutional master plan or substantial revision to such a plan is filed, the fee shall be $1,000 to be collected prior to the Department's accepting the plan;

(b) Where an abbreviated institutional master plan is filed, the fee shall be $300 to be collected prior to the Department's accepting the plan; when a Planning Commission public hearing is deemed necessary, an additional fee of $300 shall be collected prior to the Department's providing notice of the hearing.

Sec. 357. FEE FOR REVIEWING NOTICES OF SPECIAL RESTRICTIONS. The Zoning Administrator shall maintain a list of those provisions of this Code containing a requirement that a notice of restrictions be recorded in the office of the County Recorder and any applicant seeking approval of the form of such notice shall be charged a fee of $50.

Sec. 358. FEES FOR REVIEWING REFERRALS AND MASTER PLAN AMENDMENTS. In order to compensate the Department of City Planning for the cost of reviewing master plan referrals pursuant to Section 101.1 of this Code, and master plan, amendment requests from a private party with a specific interest in property which would financially benefit from the requested amendment and provided that the Department at its discretion elects to consider the requested amendment, the Department shall charge the following fees:

(a) For reviewing master plan referrals, the fee shall be $100 for those which are handled administratively and $250 for referrals requiring City Planning Commission action.

(b) For considering any request to amend land use and related plans and diagrams of the San Francisco Master Plan, the Department shall collect a fee based on the Department's estimated actual costs for time and materials required to review and implement the requested amendment, according to a budget prepared by the Director of Planning, in consultation with the sponsor of the request and approved by the City Planning Commission.

Sec. 359. FEE FOR CITY PLANNING COMMISSION REVIEW OF PROJECTS WITHIN THE C-3 (DOWNTOWN COMMERCIAL) DISTRICT. In order to compensate the Department of City Planning for the cost of reviewing projects within the C-3 (Downtown Commercial) District, pursuant to Section 309 of this Code, the Department shall charge and collect the following fees:

(a) A fee based on the fee schedule in Section 351(c) above to cover costs for determination of whether additional modifications are necessary as authorized in Section 309 of this Code;

(b) For an application for an exception, as authorized in Section 309(a) of this Code, a fee equal to 1/2 the fee as set forth in Section 351(c) shall be charged and collected by the Department of City Planning prior to accepting said application.

Sec. 360. FEE FOR REVIEWING PROJECTS SUBJECT TO OFFICE DEVELOPMENT LIMITS. In order to compensate the Department of City Planning for the cost of reviewing projects pursuant to Sections 320 through 323 of this Code, the Department shall charge and collect, at the time of application for project authorization, $15,000 per application.

Sec. 361. FEE FOR MONITORING PROJECTS. Fees under this Section shall be collected as follows:

(a) In order to compensate the Department of City Planning for the cost of monitoring authorized projects under Sections 149, 163, 164, 165 and 321 of this Code, the Department shall charge $5,000 per project, to be collected by the Central Permit Bureau at the time the Building Permit is issued.

(b) All approved applications in Section 351(c) and (d) and Section 359 shall be required to pay $100 plus time and materials beyond two hours of staff time for monitoring conditions of approval; such time and materials includes resources provided by other departments or agencies as well as the Department of City Planning.

Sec. 362. FEE FOR REVIEWING REQUESTS RELATING TO TDR AND ARTICLE 11 DESIGNATED BUILDING. Fees under this Section shall be collected as follows:

(a) For each application for designation or change of designation of a Significant or Contributory Building, the fee shall be $500.

(b) For each application for designation or change of boundary of a Conservation District, the fee shall be $500.

(c) An application for a permit for alteration of a Significant or Contributory Building or building within a designated Conservation District which the Zoning Administrator has deemed minor as provided in Section 1111 or 1111.1 shall have no fee in addition to other fees which may be applicable.

(d) An application for a permit for alteration not deemed minor, as described in Subsection (c) above shall be $200, where the estimated construction cost is less than $10,000. Where the estimated construction cost is $10,000 or more, the fee shall be the same as established in Section 351 (c) above. This fee shall be in addition to any fee otherwise required for permits to alter or demolish; provided, however, that if the permit is for alteration of a Contributory Building located outside a Conservation District from which no TDR have been transferred, and the applicant elects to proceed without issuance of a permit pursuant to Sections 1111 through 1111.6, the fee shall be $25.

(e) An application for a permit to demolish a Significant or

Contributory Building shall be $500. This fee shall be in addition to any fee otherwise required for permits to alter or demolish. However, no fee in addition to that otherwise required for a demolition permit shall be charged for an application to demolish a Contributory Building located outside a Conservation District from which no TDR have been transferred or a Category V Building in a Conservation District from which no TDR have been transferred.

(f) For each application for a Statement of Eligibility the fee shall be $500, for execution of a Certificate of Transfer the fee shall be $250, and for Certification of Transfer of TDR the fee shall be $500.

(g) For each permit application for a determination that a building is a compatible rehabilitation or a compatible replacement building, pursuant to Sections 309 and 1109, the fee shall be the same as an application for a conditional use permit.

Sec. 363. FILING FEES AND PROVISION FOR EXCEPTION. Before accepting for filing any application for designation of a landmark, or for amendment or rescission of such designation, or for an application for a certificate of appropriateness under Article 10, the Department shall charge and collect the fees here specified:

(a) For each application for designation of a landmark the fee shall be $100, for the amendment or rescission or the designation of an historical district, the fee shall be $250.

(b) For each application for a certificate of appropriateness the fee shall be $50 where the estimated construction cost is less

than $1,000 and $200 where the estimated construction cost is more than $1,000 but less than $10,000. Where the estimated construction cost is $10,000 or more, the fee shall be the same as established in Section 351(c) above.

Sec. 364. FEE FOR REVIEW OF PROJECTS UNDER DISCRETIONARY REVIEW. Any person who requests that the Department of City Planning and City Planning Commission consider a permit pursuant to Section 26 of Part III of the San Francisco Municipal Code shall include a fee of $75 with their request.

Sec. 365. FEE FOR ZONING CERTIFICATIONS RESEARCH, DOCUMENT RETRIEVAL, CERTIFICATION OF COPIES, INFORMATION, ANALYSIS TECHNICAL REPORTS AND PRESENTATIONS. In order to compensate the Department of City Planning for the cost of research, document retrieval, certification of copies, information, analysis, report preparation, and presentation and requests for Zoning Certifications, such services shall be charged as follows:

(a) Zoning Certifications, Single Family Residence, $50; Other Uses, $50 minimum for first half hour of staff time or fraction thereof, plus $50 for each subsequent hour of staff time; up to a maximum of $500.

(b) Research Services, Data Requests and Document Retrieval; $25 minimum for first half hour of staff time or fraction thereof, plus $25 for each subsequent half hour of staff time; document retrieval shall be as per a schedule prepared by the Director of Planning, which schedule shall include the actual estimated costs

paid by the Department for retrieval and return of files stored off-site.

(c) Certification of Copies; $25 per document.

(d) Information, Analysis, Report Preparation and Presentation; Time and materials as set forth in an analysis and reporting schedule, based on the Department's estimated actual costs for time and materials required to perform the work, prepared by the Director of Planning and approved by the City Planning Commission. This schedule may include provisions for amortizing costs of report preparation through factoring full cost recovery into the pricing of such information and reports.

Sec. 366. FEE FOR REVIEWING APPLICATIONS RELATING TO EXTENSION OF DEADLINE TO COMPLY WITH PROVISIONS OF SECTION 179 (d) AND SECTION 179 (f).

In order to compensate the Department of City Planning for the cost of reviewing projects relating to extension of deadline to comply with provisions of Section 179 (d) and Section 179 (f), the Department shall charge and collect the following fees at time of application.

(a) For an application for a building permit the fee shall be $1545 in addition to the fee established under Sec. 352;

(b) For an Application for a conditional use permit the fee shall be $985 in addition to the fee established under Sec. 351.

Sec. 367. TEMPORARY SURCHARGES ON PLANNING FEES.

(a) For each class of permit, filing or request listed in

Sections 351 through 359 and Sections 361 through 364 above, a two and one-half percent surcharge shall be added to the filing fee to enable the Department of City Planning to recover the costs incurred by the Department in developing and implementing the hardware and software systems required to computerize activities associated with the Department's processing of permit applications. This surcharge shall remain in effect through June 30, 1993.

(b) For each class of permit, filing or request listed in Sections 351 through 359 and Sections 361 through 364 above, a four and nine-tenths percent surcharge shall be added to the filing fee to enable the Department of City Planning to recover those costs incurred by the Department in computerizing activities associated with its processing of permit applications, including the costs of a consultant, property information database development and other time and materials costs unrelated to the hardware and software systems referred to in subsection (a) above. This surcharge shall remain in effect through June 30, 1993.

Sec. 368. FEE FOR MAINTAINING AND UPDATING PERMIT PROCESSING COMPUTER SYSTEM. For each class of permit, filing or request listed in Sections 351 through 359 and Sections 361 through 364 above, the Department of City Planning shall charge and collect at the time of filing of the application an additional fee of eight and six-tenths percent of the original fee in order to compensate the Department of City Planning for the costs directly related to maintaining its permit processing computer system and for updating

the property information data base used by the Department in activities associated with processing permit applications.

Sec. 369. FEE FOR HAZARDOUS WASTE FACILITY APPLICATIONS. In order to compensate the Department of City Planning and other City agencies for the actual costs of implementing the procedures required by California Health and Safety Code, Division 20, Chapter 6.5, Article 8.7 (commencing with Section 25199), for review of applications for specified hazardous waste facility projects, the Department shall collect a fee from project applicants as follows:

(a) The fee shall equal the City's actual costs of processing the application in accordance with the California Health and Safety Code, which requires the City to comply with notification requirements; establish, convene and provide staff assistance to a local assessment committee; provide technical assistance grants to the local assessment committee; and present the City's position on the application to the Governor's appeal board in the event of an appeal.

(b) The applicant shall pay an initial fee equal to the estimated actual time and materials costs expected to be incurred in processing the application as required by the California Health and Safety Code and estimated actual costs of technical assistance grants that the City expects to provide to the local assessment committee. The initial fee shall be itemized in a Hazardous Waste Facility Review Budget and Schedule ("Budget" and "Schedule") prepared by the Director of Planning, in consultation with the

applicant, and approved by the City Planning Commission; provided, however, that if the estimated Schedule exceeds one year, then the estimated Budget shall be prepared for the initial twelve-month period only and the estimated Budget for any subsequent twelve-month time period shall be prepared prior to the end of the prior twelve-month period.

(c) The applicant shall pay the initial fee prior to filing the notice of intent required by the State, provided, however, that the Budget and Schedule may authorize payment of the initial fee in up to four equal increments payable periodically over the period of the Schedule, in which case the first installment shall be paid prior to filing the notice of intent.

(d) Where initial payment is insufficient to compensate the actual cost incurred, the Director of Planning shall charge the applicant an additional sum equal to such actual cost after first revising the Budget and Schedule to reflect the additional cost and obtaining the approval of the City Planning Commission.

(e) Fees paid to the Department pursuant to this section shall be deposited with the Treasurer and held by the Controller and expanded in accord with the Hazardous Waste Review Budget approved pursuant to this Section.

Sec. 370. FEE FOR LATE CHARGES AND COLLECTION OF OVERDUE ACCOUNTS. In order to compensate the Department of City Planning for the costs involved in collecting overdue accounts, a surcharge of one percent per month shall be added to the fee amount owing the

Department for fee accounts in arrears more than 30 days. The Zoning Administrator may call upon other City agencies or duly licensed collection agencies for assistance in collecting delinquent accounts more than six months in arrears, in which case any additional costs of collection may be added to the fee amount outstanding. If the Department seeks the assistance of a duly licensed collection agency, the approval procedures of Administrative Code Article 5, Section 10.39-1 et. seq. will be applicable.

SEC. 371. FEE FOR ZONING AND PUBLIC INFORMATION, CONSTRUCTION SERVICES AND COMPLIANCE ACTIVITIES RELATED TO DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS AND PERMIT PROCESSING. For each class of permit, filing or request listed in Sections 351, 352, 353, and 356 above, the Department of City Planning shall charge and collect at the time of filing of the application an additional fee of $125.00 in order to compensate the Department of City Planning for zoning and public information, construction services and compliance activities related to development projects and permit processing. For building permit applications requiring Department of City Planning review, the fee shall be charged and collected by the Central Permit Bureau.

SEC. 372. PERIOD ARTICLE IS OPERATIVE. THIS ARTICLE IS OPERATIVE EFFECTIVE JULY 1, 1991 THROUGH DECEMBER 31, 1993. This Article is repealed as of January 1, 1994 unless a later enacted ordinance extends the operative period.

These amendments to fees related to the Department of City

Planning are intended to provide revenues for the increased staffing and other support necessary to provide more timely processing of applications within that Department.

The City Planning Commission shall conduct a public hearing at the end of Fiscal Year 1992-1993 to review the level of service provided by the Department of City Planning in providing improved application processing as contemplated under this ordinance. The Commission shall determine at that time whether to initiate an ordinance to extend or to otherwise modify those amendments to fees related to the Department of City Planning that are contained within this ordinance. The Commission shall provide a report and appropriate recommendations to the Board of Supervisors within one month of the close of its public hearing.))

Section 2. Part II, Chapter II, Article 3.5A of the San Francisco Municipal Code (City Planning Code) is hereby enacted to read as follows:

ARTICLE 3.5A

Sec. 350. FEES, GENERAL. Fee shall be imposed in order to compensate the Department of City Planning for the cost of processing permit applications for the establishment, abolition or modification of a setback line, for signs, demolition, reclassification of property, conditional use authorization, granting of an exemption, variance, or coastal zone permit; reviewing permit applications filed in and issued by other City departments, institutional master plans, Master Plan amendments and

referrals, projects which require review under Section 295 of this Code (park shadow ordinance) and permits requiring additional review by nature of their location within the C-3 District, projects requiring special review pursuant to Section 306.7; providing transportation review associated with project applications, providing policy and code review and interpretation, Zoning Administrator written determinations pursuant to Section 307 (a), zoning certifications, research, document retrieval and technical reports, City Planning Commission agendas, notification of project applications, computer acquisition, hazardous waste facilities review; collection of fees that are in arrears, collection of delinquent accounts. Fees shall be charged and collected as indicated for each class of application, permit, filing request or activity listed in Sections 351 through 358 below.

(a) Estimated Construction Costs are as defined by the San Francisco Building Code.

(b) All fees are payable at time of filing application or request, except where noted otherwise.

(c) Refunds - When an application is (1) either withdrawn by the applicant, or deemed cancelled by the Department of City Planning due to inactivity on the part of the applicant, and (2) the Zoning Administrator determines that no substantial costs have been incurred by the Department in acting on the application (for example, little time has been expended beyond initial scoping

meetings), then the applicant shall be entitled to a refund of 75 percent of the fee paid to the Department.

(d) Reduced Fee

(1) Any fraternal, charitable, benevolent or any other 26 non-profit organization, which organization is exempt from taxation under the Internal Revenue laws of the United States and the Revenue and Taxation Code of the State of California as a bona fide fraternal, charitable, benevolent or other non-profit organization, shall pay 75% of the fees specified in Sec. 352 (a), (g), (h), (i), (j), at the time of issuance of the building permit, as long as the fees are paid before the building permit is released to the applicant; provided that the application is for the development of residential units all of which are affordable to low and moderate income households, as defined in the Guidelines of the United States Housing and Urban Development Department, for a period of 20 years, which exemption shall apply notwithstanding the inclusion in the development of other non-profit ancillary or accessory uses. In the event that the Department of City Planning is provided information establishing that the City and County of San Francisco is contributing 50% or more of the financing for the project, but less than 75%, the fees paid by these non-

profit organizations for such affordable housing developments shall be 50% of the specified fees, and provided further, if the Department determines that the City and County of San Francisco is contributing 75% or more of the financing for the project, the fee shall be waived. For the purposes of this paragraph, funds received by the City and County of San Francisco as entitlement under Federal or State Programs and San Francisco Redevelopment Agency funds shall be considered contributions of the City and County of San Francisco.

2. An exemption from paying the full fees specified under Section 352(b) may be granted when the requestor's income is not enough to pay for the fee without affecting their abilities to pay for the necessities of life, provided that the person seeking the exemption demonstrates to the Zoning Administrator that they are substantially affected by the proposed project.

Sec. 351. ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES.

(a) Agendas for Planning Commission - $15 annual subscription to cover costs of mailing. Planning Commission Secretary may authorize exemptions in those instances where costs would impose financial hardship.

(b) Certification of Copies - $25 per document.

(c) Document Retrieval-actual estimated costs for retrieval and return of files stored off-site per schedule prepared by Director of Planning. No charge is allowed for labor costs incurred in document retrieval, only out-of-pocket expenses paid by the Department.

(d) Information, Analysis, Report Preparation and Presentation Time and materials as set forth in an analysis and reporting schedule, based on the Department's estimated actual costs for time and materials required to perform the work, prepared by the Director of Planning and approved by the City Planning Commission. The costs of report preparation may be amortized by factoring full cost recovery into the pricing of such information and reports.

(e) Late Charges and Collection of Overdue Accounts - A surcharge of one percent per month shall be added to the fee amount owing the Department for fee accounts in arrears more than 30 days. The Zoning Administrator may call upon other City agencies or duly licensed collection agencies for assistance in collecting delinquent accounts more than six month in arrears, in which case any additional costs of collection may be added to the fee amount outstanding. If the Department seeks the assistance of a duly licensed collection agency, the approval procedures of Administrative Code Article 5, Section 10.39-1 et. seq. will be applicable.

(f) Monitoring Projects. - Fee to be collected at the time of building permit issuance, by the Central Permit Bureau.

5/10/93

ejp

(1) Authorized projects under Sections 149, 163, 164, 165 and 321 - $5,000 per project.

(2) All approved applications in Section 352(a) and (i), 353 (a) and (b), and 355 - $110 for two hours of staff time or portion thereof plus time and materials beyond first two hours of staff time for monitoring conditions of approval established pursuant to a public hearing by the City Planning Commission or Zoning Administrator; such time and materials includes resources provided by other departments or agencies as well as the Department of City Planning. For monitoring required subsequent to the time of permit issuance or where no permit is required, the fee will be charged and collected by the Department.

(g) Notices of Special Restrictions, review and approval, for recordation in Office of County Recorder - $60.

(h) Policy and Code Review and Interpretation for prospective projects for which an application has not been filed - $110 for two hours of staff time or fraction thereof plus time and materials beyond first two hours of staff time. Initial fee to be paid prior to meeting date.

(i) Project Notifications for an Individual or Organization Requesting Notification of Project Applications

(1) First Address or First Assessor's Block - $25 per annum.

(2) Additional Addresses - $10 for addresses in each new

Assessor's Block thereafter, per annum.

(j) Research Services and Data Requests - $27.50 minimum for first half hour of staff time or fraction there of, plus $27.50 for each subsequent half hour of staff time.

(k) Zoning Administrator written determinations pursuant to Section 307(a) - $55 minimum for first hour of staff time or fraction thereof, plus $55 for each subsequent hour of staff time up to a maximum of $500.

(l) Zoning Certifications.

(1) Single Family Residence - $50.

(2) Others Uses - $55 minimum for first hour of staff time or fraction thereof, plus $55 for each subsequent hour of staff time up to a maximum of $500.

Sec. 352. COMMISSION AND VARIANCE HEARING APPLICATIONS.

(a) Conditional Use (Sec. 303) and Coastal Zone Permit (Sec. 330) Applications.

Estimated Construction Cost	Fee
Less than $10,000	$600
$10,000 to $999,999	$750 plus .34% of cost over $10,000
$1,000,000 to $4,999,999	$4,121 plus .39% of cost over $1,000,000
$5,000,000 to $9,999,999	$19,889 plus .34% of cost over $5,000,000

///

$10,000,000 to $29,999,999	$36,912 plus .17% of cost over $10,000,000
$30,000,000 to $49,999,999	$71,795 plus .11% of cost over $30,000,000
$50,000,000 to $99,999,999	$93,297 plus .07% of cost over $50,000,000
$100,000,000 or more	$129,135 plus .02% of cost over $100,000,000
No construction cost	$750 plus time and materials in excess of fee paid

(1) Applications with verified violations of this Code - time and materials in excess of fee for renotification, investigation and research relating to processing applications, where the applicant has failed to respond fully, and within the time requested, to a notice of incomplete application citing the code violations with direction for their correction, not to exceed five times the amount of the initial fee.

(2) Where an applicant requests both a conditional use authorization and a coastal zone permit review the amount of the conditional use fee shall be reduced by 50%.

(3) Minor project modifications requiring a public hearing

to amend conditions of approval of a previously authorized project, not requiring a substantial reevaluation of the prior authorization - $750 plus time and materials in excess of fee paid.

(b) Discretionary Review Request - $75.

(c) Institutional Master Plan (Sec. 304.5).

(1) Full Institutional Master Plan or substantial revision - $5,500 for first 100 hours of staff time or portion thereof plus time and materials beyond first 100 staff hours.

(2) Abbreviated Institutional Master Plan - $550 for first five hours of staff time or fraction thereof plus time and materials beyond first 10 staff hours.

(d) Land Use Amendments and Related Plans and Diagrams of the San Francisco Master Plan - Fee based on the Department's estimated actual costs for time and materials required to review and implement the requested amendment, according to a budget prepared by the Director of Planning, in consultation with the sponsor of the request.

(e) Master Plan Referrals (Sec. 101.1) - $110 for two hours of staff time or fraction thereof plus time and materials beyond first two hours of staff time.

(1) Redevelopment Plan Review - the Director of Planning shall prepare a budget to cover actual time and materials expected to be incurred, in consultation with

the Redevelopment Agency. A sum equal to one-half the expected cost will be submitted to the Department, prior to the commencement of the review. The remainder of the costs will be due at the time the initial payment is depleted.

(f) Neighborhood Commercial District Regulations, Extension of deadline for applications for compliance (Sec. 179).

(1) Building Permit - $1,545 in addition to fee under Sec. 355(a).

(2) Conditional Use Permit - $985 in addition to fee under Sec. 352(a).

(g) Planned Unit Development (Sec. 304) - same as fee schedule for conditional use (Sec. 352(a)) plus time and materials for any cost beyond the fee paid, not to exceed twice the amount of the initial fee.

(h) Reclassify property or impose interim zoning controls - $3,000 plus $600 per additional Assessor's Block or portion thereof.

(1) The applicant shall be charged for any time and materials beyond the fees established in Sec. 352 (h), not to exceed twice the amount of the initial fee.

(2) Applications with verified violations of this Code - time and materials in excess of fee for renotification, investigation and research relating to processing applications, where the applicant has failed to respond

fully, and within the time requested, to a notice of incomplete application citing the code violations with direction for their correction, not to exceed five times the amount of the initial fee.

(i) Setback Line, establish, modify or abolish - $1500 for each affected block frontage or portion thereof.

(j) Variances (Sec. 305).

Estimated Construction Cost	Fee
Less than $10,000	$1,000
$10,000 to $999,999	$1,000 + .46% of cost over $10,000
$1,000,000 to $4,999,999	$5,516 plus .55% of cost over $1,000,000
$5,000,000 to $9,999,999	$27,670 plus .46% of cost over $5,000,000
$10,000,000 to $29,999,999	$50,476 plus .24% of cost over $10,000,000
$30,000,000 to $49,999,999	$99,346 plus .15% of cost over $30,000,000
$50,000,000 to $99,999,999	$128,668 plus .1% of cost over $50,000,000
$100,000,000 or more	$177,538 plus .03% of cost over $100,000,000
No construction cost	$1,000 plus time and materials in excess of fee

paid

(1) The applicant shall be charged for any time and materials beyond the fees established in Sec. 352 (i), not to exceed twice the amount of the initial fee.

(2) Applications with verified violations of this Code - time and materials in excess of fee for renotification, investigation and research relating to processing applications citing the code violations with direction for their correction, where the applicant has failed to respond fully, and within the time requested, to a notice of incomplete application, not to exceed five times the amount of the initial fee.

(3) Minor project modifications requiring a public hearing to amend conditions of approval of a previously authorized project, not requiring a substantial reevaluation of the prior authorization - $750 plus time and materials in excess of fee paid.

(k) Hazardous Waste Facility Applications (California Health and Safety Code, Division 20, Chapter 6.5, Article 8.7, commencing with Section 25199).

(1) The fee shall equal the City's actual costs of processing the application in accordance with the California Health and Safety Code, which requires the City to comply with notification requirements; establish, convene and provide staff assistance to a

local assessment committee; provide technical assistance grants to the local assessment committee; and present the City's position on the application to the Governor's appeal board in the event of an appeal.

(2) The applicant shall pay an initial fee equal to the estimated actual time and materials costs expected to be incurred in processing the application as required by the California Health and Safety Code and estimated actual costs of technical assistance grants that the City expects to provide to the local assessment committee. The initial fee shall be itemized in a Hazardous Waste Facility Review Budget and Schedule ("Budget" and "Schedule") prepared by the Director of Planning, in consultation with the applicant, and approved by the City Planning Commission; provided, however, that if the estimated Schedule exceeds one year, then the estimated Budget shall be prepared for the initial twelve-month period only and the estimated Budget for any subsequent twelve-month time period shall be prepared prior to the end of the prior twelve-month period.

(3) The applicant shall pay the initial fee prior to filing the notice of intent required by the State, provided, however, that the Budget and Schedule may authorize payment of the initial fee in up to four equal

increments payable periodically over the period of the Schedule, in which case the first installment shall be paid prior to filing the notice of intent.

(4) Where initial payment is insufficient to compensate the actual cost incurred, the Director of Planning shall charge the applicant an additional sum equal to such actual cost after first revising the Budget and Schedule to reflect the additional cost and obtaining the approval of the City Planning Commission.

(5) Fees paid to the Department pursuant to this section shall be deposited with the Treasurer and held by the Controller and expended in accord with the hazardous Waste Review Budget approved pursuant to this Section.

Sec. 353. DOWNTOWN APPLICATIONS.

(a) Exception in C-3 District (Section 309) - 1/2 the fee for conditional use (Sec.352(a)).

(b) Modifications in C-3 District, Determination of Need (Section 309) - same as fee schedule for conditional use (Sec.352(a)).

(c) Office Development Limitation Projects (Section 320 through 323) - $15,000 per application.

(d) Transfer of Development Rights and Article II Designated Buildings.

(1) Significant or Contributory Building, designation or change of boundary - $670.

(2) Conservation District, designation or change of boundary - $670.

(3) Permit for alteration of a Significant or Contributory Building within a designated Conservation District, not deemed minor by the Zoning Administrator.

Estimated Construction Cost	Fee
Less than $1,000	$200
$1,000 to $9,999	$400
$10,000 to $999,999	$750 plus .34% over $10,000
$1,000,000 to $4,999,999	$4,155 plus .39% over $1,000,000
$5,000,000 to $9,999,999	$19,923 plus .34% over $5,000,000
$10,000,000 to $29,999,999	$36,946 plus .17% over $10,000,000
$30,000,000 to $49,999,999	$71,829 plus .11% over $30,000,000
$50,000,000 to $99,999,999	$93,332 plus .07% over $50,000,000
$100,000,000 or more	$129,170 plus .02% over $100,000,000
No construction cost	$400 plus time and materials in excess of fee paid

(4) Alteration of a Contributory Building located outside a

Conservation District from which no TDR have been transferred and no issuance of a permit pursuant to Sections IIII through IIII.6 - $25.

(5) Significant or Contributory Building Demolition - $670. This fee shall be in addition to any fee otherwise required for permits to alter or demolish. However, applications to demolish a Contributory Building located outside a Conservatory District from which no TDR have been transferred or a Category V Building in a conservation District from which no TDR have been transferred are subject only to the demolition fee contained in Sec. 355(6)(b).

(6) Statement of Eligibility - $500.

(7) Certificate of Transfer, Execution - $250.

(8) Certification of Transfer of TDR - $500.

Sec. 354. ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW. SEE ADMINISTRATIVE CODE, SECTION 31.46A FOR FEES.

Sec. 355. PERMIT APPLICATIONS.

(a) Building Permit Applications for a new building, change in use or alter the exterior of an existing building to be collected by Central Permit Bureau.

Estimated Construction Cost	Fee
$500 or less	$90
$501 to $999	$90 plus 10% of cost over $500
$1000 to $1999	$140 plus 6% of cost over $1000

$2000 to $4999	$200 plus 3% of cost over $2000
$5000 to $9999	$290 plus 1% of cost over $5000
$10,000 to $199,999	$340 plus .2% of cost over $10,000
$200,000 to $4,999,999	$720 plus .17% of cost over $200,000
$5,000,000 to $9,999,999	$8870 plus .15% of cost over $5,000,000
$10,000,000 or more	$16,370 plus .14% of cost over $10,000,000
No construction cost	$190 plus time and materials in excess of fee paid

(1) Applications with verified violations of this Code - time and materials in excess of fee for renotification, investigation and research relating to processing applications, where the applicant has failed to respond fully, and within the time requested, to a notice of incomplete application citing the code violations with direction for their correction, not to exceed five times the amount of the initial fee.

(2) Back-Check Fee for Permit Revisions - $55 an hour, to be collected at time of permit issuance.

(3) Design Guidelines and Code-Complying Massing Recommendations, Site-Specific - $110 plus time and materials beyond 2 hours, to be collected at time of

permit issuance.

(4) C-3 (Downtown Commercial) District Notification Fee (Sec. 309) - additional $200.

(5) New Construction or Alteration Exceeding 40 Fee in Height (Section 295) - additional $200.

(6) Projects requiring review under special review procedures established by the City Planning Commission pursuant to interim legislation adopted as interim controls pursuant to Section 306.7, during the period of time such controls are in effect, including any extensions - $275.

(b) Demolition Applications, to be collected by Central Permit Bureau.

(1) Administratively reviewed - $400.

(2) Requiring Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board Action- $550 plus time and materials beyond 10 hours.

(c) Fire, Police and Health Department Permit Applications Review - $45 to be collected by the other departments in conjunction with current fee collections.

(d) Sign Applications, to be collected by Central Permit Bureau - $90.

Sec. 356. PRESERVATION APPLICATIONS (Article 10).

(a) Landmark - $250.

(b) Amendment, Rescission or Designation of historical district - $400.

(c) Certificate of Appropriateness

Estimated Construction Cost	Fee
Less than $1,000	$200
$1,000 to $9,999	$400
$10,000 or more	Conditional Use Fee Schedule (Sec. 352(a))

(d) Determination that a building is a compatible rehabilitation or a compatible replacement building, pursuant to Sections 309 or 1109 - Same as Conditional Use Fee Schedule (Sec. 352 (a)).

Sec. 357. TRANSPORTATION REVIEW ASSOCIATED WITH PROJECT APPLICATIONS.

(a) Initial transportation assessment to determine whether transportation study is required - $110.

(b) Transportation study - $4,400 plus time and materials for costs incurred beyond the initial fee.

Sec. 358. TEMPORARY SURCHARGES ON PLANNING FEES.

(a) For each class of permit, filing or request listed in Sections 351 through 357 an 8% surcharge shall be added to the filing fee to enable the Department of City Planning to recover the cost incurred by the Department in developing and implementing the hardware and software systems required to computerize activities associated with the Department's processing of permit applications. This surcharge shall remain in effect through June 30, 1994.

Sec. 359. PERIOD ARTICLE IS OPERATIVE. THIS ARTICLE IS OPERATIVE

EFFECTIVE JULY 1, 1991 THROUGH DECEMBER 31, ((1993)) 1995. This Article is repealed as of January 1, ((1994)) 1996 unless a later enacted ordinance extends the operative period.

These amendments to fees related to the Department of City Planning are intended to provide revenues for the increased staffing and other support necessary to provide more timely processing of applications within that Department. The City Planning Commission shall conduct public hearings at the end of Fiscal Year 1992-1993, Fiscal Year 1993-94 and Fiscal Year 1994-1995 to review the level of service provided by the Department of City Planning in providing improved application processing as contemplated under this ordinance. The Commission shall determine at its public hearing at the end of Fiscal Year 1994-95 whether to initiate an ordinance to extend or to otherwise modify those amendments to fees related to the Department of City Planning that are contained within this ordinance. The Commission shall provide a report and appropriate recommendations to the Board of Supervisors within one month of the close of its public hearing.

Section 3. Part II, Chapter II, Article 3.5 of the San Francisco Municipal Code (City Planning Code) is hereby amended to read as follows:

ARTICLE 3.5

FEES

TEXT OF SECTION OPERATIVE JANUARY 1, 1996

SEC.365. OPERATIVE DATE. Article 3.5 shall become operative

January 1, ((1994)) 1996.

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

LOUISE H. RENNE
City Attorney

By Judith A. Bapajian
Deputy City Attorney

Board of Supervisors, San Francisco

Passed for Second Reading	$	Finally Passed
	$	
May 10, 1993	$	May 17, 1993
	$	
	$	
Ayes: Supervisors Alioto Bierman	$	Ayes: Supervisors Alioto Bierman
Conroy Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman	$	Conroy Hallinan Kaufman Kennedy
Kennedy Maher Migden Shelley	$	Maher Migden Shelley
	$	
Absent: Supervisor Achtenberg	$	Absent: Supervisors Achtenberg
	$	Hsieh

I hereby certify that the foregoing ordinance was finally passed by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco

Jean Lum
Acting Clerk

File No.
115-93-4

MAY 25 1993
Date Approved

Frank M. Jordan
Mayor

As amended in Board 5/17/93

FILE NO. 62-93-2 ORDINANCE NO. 154-93

[APPROVING 49ERS CANDLESTICK PARK LEASE AMENDMENT]

APPROVIING A LEASE AMENDMENT ENTERED INTO BETWEEN THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO AND THE SAN FRANCISCO 49ERS, WHICH WOULD CHANGE THE FORMULA BY WHICH CONCESSION REVENUES ARE ALLOCATED TO THE CITY AND THE 49ERS, CONTINGENT UPON THE RECREATION AND PARK COMMISSION APPROVING AN AMENDMENT TO PARAGRAPH 2 OF THE EIGHTH AMENDMENT THAT WOULD PROVIDE THAT THE TERMS OF PARAGRAPH 2 ARE SUBJECT TO FURTHER NEGOTIATION SHOULD EITHER PARTY SO DESIRE AFTER JANUARY 1, 2001.

5/17/93 ejp

Be it ordained by the people of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. That the Eighth Amendment to Stadium Lease between by an between the City and County of San Francisco, acting through the Recreation and Park Commission, and the San Francisco Forty Niners, a copy of which amendment is on file in the Office of the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors and to which reference is hereby made, is hereby approved, contingent upon the Recreation and Park Commission approving an amendment to paragraph 2 of the Eighth Amendment to the Stadium Lease that would provide that the terms of paragraph 2 are subject to further negotiation should either party so desire after January 1, 2001.

5/17/93 ejp

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

LOUISE H. RENNE, City Attorney

By: Theodore R. Lakey
Deputy City Attorney

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Board of Supervisors, San Francisco

Passed for Second Reading	Finally Passed
May 17, 1993	May 24, 1993
Ayes: Supervisors Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Kaufman Kennedy Maher Shelley	Ayes: Supervisors Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Kennedy Migden Shelley
Absent: Supervisors Achtenberg Hsieh Migden	Absent: Supervisors Achtenberg Maher

I hereby certify that the foregoing ordinance was finally passed by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco

Jean Lemon
Acting Clerk

File No. 62-93-2

MAY 28 1993
Date Approved

Frank M. Jordan
Mayor

DOCUMENTS DEPT.
JUN 14 1993
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

FILE NO. 92-93-17 ORDINANCE NO. 155-93

(Road Commissioner)

APPOINTING ROAD COMMISSIONER FOR THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, AND REPEALING ORDINANCE NO. 23-88.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. After public hearing and due deliberation, as required by Section 2006 of the Streets and Highways Code, and due to the retirement of Richard Evans, previous Director of Public Works, this Board of Supervisors hereby finds that it is in the interest of economy and efficiency to appoint the current Director of Public Works to serve as Road Commissioner, and hereby further finds that the said Director of Public Works is qualified and competent to handle the road and highway work of the City and County of San Francisco.

Section 2. The Board of Supervisors hereby appoints John E. Cribbs, Director of Public Works, to serve as Road Commissioner for the City and County of San Francisco.

Section 3. Ordinance No. 23-88 appointing Richard Evans, previous Director of Public Works, to serve as Road Commissioner for the City and County of San Francisco is hereby repealed.

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

LOUISE H. RENNE, City Attorney

By: Theodore R. Lakey
Deputy City Attorney

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Board of Supervisors, San Francisco

Passed for Second Reading	§	Finally Passed
May 17, 1993	§	May 24, 1993
Ayes: Supervisors Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Kaufman Kennedy Maher Migden Shelley	§	Ayes: Supervisors Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Kennedy Migden Shelley
Absent: Supervisors Achtenberg Hsieh	§	Absent: Supervisors Achtenberg Maher

I hereby certify that the foregoing ordinance was finally passed by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco

Jean Lum
Acting Clerk

File No. 92-93-17

MAY 28 1993
Date Approved

Frank M. Jordan
Mayor

DOCUMENTS DEPT.
JUN 14 1993
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

FILE NO. 97-93-25 ORDINANCE NO. 156-93

[PROPERTY TAX ALLOCATION]

AMENDING THE SAN FRANCISCO ADMINISTRATIVE CODE BY ADDING SECTIONS 10.7-2 THROUGH 10.7-2.3 THERETO, TO REQUIRE THE CONTROLLER TO ALLOCATE PROPERTY TAXES COLLECTED IN THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE LAWS GOVERNING APPORTIONMENT DURING FISCAL YEAR 1992-93.

Note: This section is entirely new.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. The San Francisco Administrative Code is hereby amended by adding Section 10.7-2 through 10.7-2.3 thereto to read as follows:

SEC. 10.7-2 Findings and Intent

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco finds and determines that:

a. As an essential element of the local agency home rule guaranteed by the California Constitution, property taxes collected in a county have always been intended for use in that county.

b. Proposition 13, as adopted in June of 1978 and amended thereafter, allows the Legislature to specify how the property taxes collected in a county are to be apportioned among the

county and the cities and districts therein, but did not contemplate that property taxes would be taken for State purposes or would be apportioned in a manner inconsistent with the home rule provisions of the Constitution of California.

c. Proposition 98, as adopted in November of 1988 and amended by Proposition 111 in June of 1990, provides that a county's portion of school funding is the amount of property taxes provided to the schools in the county for fiscal 1987-88, adjusted annually for cost of living increases. Pursuant to Proposition 98, the State's portion of school funding is the amount that, when added to the counties' portion, will bring total school funding up to the level specified in the Proposition.

d. The Legislature of California has expressed its intent to take approximately $2,600,000,000 of the property taxes collected in California counties in fiscal 1993-94 and use those funds to pay a substantial part of the State's portion of school funding or to pay other States expenses, in clear violation of the letter and intent of Proposition 98 and of Articles XIIIA and XIIIB of the California Constitution.

e. For fiscal 1992-93, available revenues have fallen far short of the expenditures necessary to meet the critical needs of the City and County of San Francisco, requiring that essential City and County services be cut substantially.

f. If the gap between available revenues and necessary expenditures increases to any significant extent for fiscal

DOCUMENTS DEPT
JUN 14 1993
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

1993-94, the City and County will not be able to fund State mandates and provide for the essential health, safety and general welfare of its citizens that is requisite to meaningful home rule.

g. If the Legislature acts upon its expressed intent to take approximately $2,600,000,000 of the property taxes collected in California counties in fiscal 1993-94 and use those funds to pay a substantial part of the State's portion of school funding or to pay other State expenses, this City and County would lose a very significant part of the funding now used to provide critical City and County services, would be prevented from providing for the essential health, safety and general welfare of its citizens, and would be deprived of meaningful home rule in contravention of the Constitution of California.

h. The City and County of San Francisco Board of Supervisors hereby finds that the aforesaid intended State action would constitute and illegal confiscation of the property taxes of this City and County, in that such action would prevent the City and County from providing for the essential health, safety and general welfare of its citizens, would prevent the meaningful home rule guaranteed by the constitution of California, would violate the schools funding scheme of Proposition 98 by requiring this City and County to pay a substantial part of the State portion of school funding, would violate Section 6 of Article XIIIB of the State Constitution by mandating increased local agency funding of schools without State reimbursement, and would

be in excess of the power given to the Legislature in Section 1(a) of Article XIIIA of the State Constitution lawfully to apportion property taxes among the City and County therein.

j. The City and County of San Francisco therefore, determines, that it is necessary to take action to prevent the intended State confiscation of the property taxes to be collected in the City and County of San Francisco for fiscal 1993-94 and to insure the preservation of the constitutionally guaranteed powers of home rule, including the power to provide for the essential health, safety and general welfare of the citizens of the City and County. This ordinance, therefore, provides for the lawful apportionment among the City and County therein of the property taxes collected in this City and County in fiscal 1993-94.

SEC. 10.7-2.1 Apportionment

Notwithstanding any provisions of State law to the contrary, the apportionment of property taxes among the City and County, school districts (including community college district) and other districts therein shall be in the manner such apportionment was made for fiscal 1992-93 pursuant to Chapter 6 of Part 0.5 of Division 1 of the Revenue and Taxation Code of California.

SEC. 10.7-2.2 Collection and Disbursement

The Controller of the City and County of San Francisco shall collect, apportion and disburse property taxes for fiscal 1993-94 in accordance with Section 2 unless and until the Board

of Supervisors by resolution directs another method.

SEC. 10.7-2.3 Circumstances Invoking Operation of This Ordinance

In accordance with the findings and intent of Section A, this ordinance will become operative, and property taxes shall be collected, apportioned and disbursed in accordance herewith, in the event the State enacts legislation that would result in the aforesaid confiscation of property taxes collect in the City and County of San Francisco in fiscal 1993-94.

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

LOUISE H. RENNE, City Attorney

By: _____
Deputy City Attorney

Shelley

5/03/93
5274g

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Board of Supervisors, San Francisco

Passed for Second Reading	Finally Passed
May 17, 1993	May 24, 1993
Ayes: Supervisors Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Kaufman Kennedy Maher Migden Shelley	Ayes: Supervisors Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Kennedy Migden Shelley
Absent: Supervisors Achtenberg Hsieh	Absent: Supervisors Achtenberg Maher

I hereby certify that the foregoing ordinance was finally passed by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco

Jean Lum
Acting Clerk

File No.
97-93-25

MAY 28 1993
Date Approved

Frank M. Jordan
Mayor

DOCUMENTS DEPT.
JUN 14 1993
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

FILE NO. 101-92-69

Budget

ORDINANCE NO. 157-93

(Government Funding)

RO# 92221 SA# 95 & 100

APPROPRIATING $200,000 FOR OVERTIME, POLICE DEPARTMENT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1992 - 93.

Be it ordained by the people of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. FUNDS ARE HEREBY APPROPRIATED FOR FY 1992-93 AS FOLLOWS:

Department and Number	Source of Funds and Purpose of Appropriation	Amount Debit	Amount Credit
02 - 005	**Narcotics Forfeiture & Seizure Fund**		
38 - 03 - 13	Police Department		
Project 001 - 00	Revenue - Narcotics Fund		
65-6531 (050062)	Narcotics Forfeiture	$200,000	
Project 018 - 01	Narcotics Enforcement		
03-0100 (580324)	Overtime		$200,000

APPROVED AS TO FORM:
LOUISE H. RENNE, CITY ATTORNEY

BY: Thomas O. Owen
DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY

FUNDS AVAILABLE:

John Wheadon
CONTROLLER

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Board of Supervisors, San Francisco

Passed for Second Reading	Finally Passed
May 17, 1993	May 24, 1993
Ayes: Supervisors Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Kaufman Kennedy Migden Shelley	Ayes: Supervisors Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Kennedy Migden Shelley
Absent: Supervisors Achtenberg Hsieh Maher	Absent: Supervisors Achtenberg Maher

I hereby certify that the foregoing ordinance was finally passed by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco

Jean Lum
Acting Clerk

File No. 101-92-69

MAY 28 1993
Date Approved

Frank M. Jordan
Mayor

DOCUMENTS
JUN 14 1993
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

FILE NO. 101-92-70

Budget

ORDINANCE NO. 158-93

(Government Funding)

RO# 92224 SA# 96

APPROPRIATING $377,859 FOR WORKER'S COMPENSATION, POLICE DEPARTMENT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1992 - 93.

Be it ordained by the people of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. FUNDS ARE HEREBY APPROPRIATED FOR FY 1992-93 AS FOLLOWS:

Department and Number	Source of Funds and Purpose of Appropriation	Amount Debit	Amount Credit
01 - 001	**General Fund**		
99 - 00 - 00	General Fund Unallocated		
GL 496 (000026)	Unappropriated Revenue Reserved		
Subsidiary 000006	General Reserve	$377,859	
38 - 00 - 00	Police Department		
Project 195 - 38	Worker's Compensation		
30-3700 (580340)	Services of Other Departments - Worker's Compensation		$377,859

APPROVED AS TO FORM:
LOUISE H. RENNE, CITY ATTORNEY

BY: [signature]
DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY

FUNDS AVAILABLE:

[signature]
CONTROLLER

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Board of Supervisors, San Francisco

Passed for Second Reading	Finally Passed
May 17, 1993	May 24, 1993
Ayes: Supervisors Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Kaufman Kennedy Migden Shelley	Ayes: Supervisors Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Kennedy Migden Shelley
Absent: Supervisors Achtenberg Hsieh Maher	Absent: Supervisors Achtenberg Maher

I hereby certify that the foregoing ordinance was finally passed by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco

[signature]
Acting Clerk

File No.
101-92-70

MAY 28 1993
Date Approved

[signature]
Mayor

DOCUMENTS DEPT
JUN 14 1993
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

FILE NO. 101-92-71

Budget
ORDINANCE NO. 159-93

(Government Funding)

RO# 92225 SA# 94

APPROPRIATING $336,000 FOR PERMANENT SALARIES - MISCELLANEOUS AND RELATED MANDATORY FRINGE BENEFITS, POLICE DEPARTMENT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1992 - 93.

Be it ordained by the people of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. FUNDS ARE HEREBY APPROPRIATED FOR FY 1992-93 AS FOLLOWS:

Department and Number	Source of Funds and Purpose of Appropriation	Amount Debit	Amount Credit
01 - 001	**General Fund**		
99 - 00 - 00	General Fund Unappropriated		
GL 491 (000026)	Unappropriated Revenue Retained		
Subsidiary 000009	Police - Senior Escort Reserve	$336,000	
38 - 06 - 41	Senior Escort - Police Department		
01-0010 (580142)	Permanent Salaries - Miscellaneous		$280,000
04-0600 (580142)	Mandatory Fringe Benefits		56,000
	Total	**$336,000**	**$336,000**

APPROVED AS TO FORM:
LOUISE H. RENNE, CITY ATTORNEY

BY: [signature]
DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY

FUNDS AVAILABLE:

[signature]
CONTROLLER

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Board of Supervisors, San Francisco

Passed for Second Reading

May 17, 1993

Ayes: Supervisors Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Kaufman Kennedy Migden Shelley

Absent: Supervisors Achtenberg Hsieh Maher

Finally Passed

May 24, 1993

Ayes: Supervisors Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Kennedy Migden Shelley

Absent: Supervisors Achtenberg Maher

I hereby certify that the foregoing ordinance was finally passed by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco

[signature]
Acting Clerk

File No.
101-92-71

MAY 28 1993
Date Approved

[signature]
Mayor

DOCUMENTS DEPT
JUN 14 1993
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

As amended in Committee
5/12/93

FILE NO. 101-92-72 ORDINANCE NO. 160-93

(Government Funding) RO# 92227 SA# 81

kg
5/12/93

APPROPRIATING $15,430,000 FOR VARIOUS CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS, (FIRE DEPARTMENT AND FINE ARTS MUSEUM),DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1992 - 93: placing $8,053,400 on reserve.

Be it ordained by the people of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. FUNDS ARE HEREBY APPROPRIATED FOR FY 1992-93 AS FOLLOWS:

Department and Number	Source of Funds and Purpose of Appropriation	Amount Debit	Amount Credit
05 - 613	**1989 Earthquake Safety Bond Fund**		
90 - 02 - 00	Public Works		
55-5500 (053595)	Proceeds - Sale of Bonds	$15,430,000	
31 - 03 - 00	Fire Department		
Project 100 - 01	Various Fire Stations Improvement		
20-2030 (530261)	Capital Improvement Project		$9,325,000
61 - 00 - 00	Fine Arts Museum		
Project 160 - 01	Legion of Honor - Improvements		
20-2030 (401265)	Capital Improvement Project		6,105,000
	Total	$15,430,000	$15,430,000

kg
5/12/93

Sec. 2. Funds in the amount of $8,053,400 (construction costs for seven Fire Stations Ashbury Tank Facility, Fire Department's Headquarters Building) are hereby placed on on reserve pending selection of contractors, determination of cost details and the MBE/WBE status of the contractors, to be released by the Budget Committee.

APPROVED AS TO FORM:
LOUISE H. RENNE, CITY ATTORNEY

BY: [signature]
DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY

FUNDS AVAILABLE:

[signature]
CONTROLLER

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Board of Supervisors, San Francisco

Passed for Second Reading	Finally Passed
May 17, 1993	May 24, 1993
Ayes: Supervisors Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Kaufman Kennedy Maher Migden Shelley	Ayes: Supervisors Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Kennedy Migden Shelley
Absent: Supervisors Achtenberg Hsieh	Absent: Supervisors Achtenberg Maher

I hereby certify that the foregoing ordinance was finally passed by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco

[signature]
Acting Clerk

File No.
101-92-72

MAY 28 1993
Date Approved

[signature]
Mayor

DOCUMENTS DEPT.
JUN 14 1993
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

FILE NO. 101-92-73

(Government Funding)

Budget
ORDINANCE NO. 141-93

RO# 92228 SA# 74

APPROPRIATING AND CERTIFYING $62,017 FOR CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECT TO COVER 10% OVERAGE AS PER CHARTER SECTION 7.203, PROVIDING FOR RATIFICATION OF ACTION PREVIOUSLY TAKEN, DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1992 - 93.

Be it ordained by the people of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. FUNDS ARE HEREBY APPROPRIATED FOR FY 1992-93 AS FOLLOWS:

Department and Number	Source of Funds and Purpose of Appropriation	Amount Debit	Amount Credit
05 - 615	**1990 EARTHQUAKE SAFETY BOND FUND**		
90 - 02 - 00	**Public Works**		
Project 236 - 41	Marina Green Park		
20-2030 (772202)	Capital Improvement Project	$62,017	$62,017

Section 2. Although the City has incurred no legal obligation under the Charter, the Board of Supervisors does hereby appropriate the funds necessary for the obligation and does hereby ratify the action previously taken.

APPROVED AS TO FORM:
LOUISE H. RENNE, CITY ATTORNEY

BY: Thomas J. Owen
DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY

FUNDS AVAILABLE:

John Wolfe
CONTROLLER

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Board of Supervisors, San Francisco

Passed for Second Reading

May 17, 1993

Ayes: Supervisors Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Kaufman Kennedy Maher Migden Shelley

Absent: Supervisors Achtenberg Hsieh

Finally Passed

May 24, 1993

Ayes: Supervisors Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Kennedy Migden Shelley

Absent: Supervisors Achtenberg Maher

I hereby certify that the foregoing ordinance was finally passed by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco

Jean Lucas
Acting Clerk

File No. 101-92-73

MAY 28 1993
Date Approved

Frank M. Jordan
Mayor

DOCUMENTS DEPT
JUN 14 1993
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

[Rent Ordinance]

AMENDING THE SAN FRANCISCO ADMINISTRATIVE CODE BY AMENDING SECTIONS 37.4, 37.7, 37.8 AND 37.11A THEREOF TO PROVIDE THAT PETITIONS FOR CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS, REHABILITATION, AND ENERGY CONSERVATION MEASURES MUST BE FILED NO LATER THAN FIVE YEARS AFTER THE WORK HAS BEEN COMPLETED; TO LIMIT THE AMOUNT HEARING OFFICERS MAY REFUND TO TENANTS FOR NULL AND VOID RENT INCREASES, TO LIMIT THE AMOUNT TENANTS MAY RECOVER IN CIVIL ACTIONS FOR NULL AND VOID RENT INCREASES AND TO CHANGE THE TITLE OF EXECUTIVE SECRETARY TO EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR.

Note: Additions or substitutions are underlined; deletions are in ((double parentheses)).

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

SEC. 37.4. Establishment; Appointment; Terms; Executive ((Secretary)) Director; Funding; Compensation.

(a) There is hereby established a board to be known as the San Francisco Residential Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Board (hereinafter called "Board"), consisting of five (5) members. Members, each of whom shall have a specific alternate having the same qualifications as the member, shall serve at the pleasure of the Mayor. All members and alternates shall be appointed by the Mayor.

(b) The board shall consist of two (2) landlords, two (2) tenants, and one (1) person who is neither a landlord nor a

tenant and who owns no residential rental property and an alternate for each specific member. All members shall be residents of the City and County of San Francisco.

(c) In accordance with applicable state law, all members shall disclose all present holdings and interests in real property, including interests in corporations, trusts or other entities with real property holdings.

(d) All members shall be appointed by the Mayor to serve forty-eight (48) month terms. All vacancies occurring during a term shall be filled for the unexpired term.

(e) Commencing with the date upon which the first members take office, the board shall elect a chairman and vice-chairman from among its members.

(f) The position of executive ((secretary to the board)) director shall be established pursuant to and subject to Charter Sections 3.500 and 8.200. The person occupying the position of executive ((secretary)) director shall be appointed by the chairman of the board with the approval of a majority of the members. All staff personnel shall be under the immediate direction and supervision of the executive ((secretary)) director.

(g) Pursuant to the budgetary and fiscal provisions of the Charter, the board of supervisors shall provide funds to pay for staff personnel, services and facilities as may be reasonably necessary to enable the board to exercise its powers and perform its duties under this chapter. A special fund to be known as the

DOCUMENTS DEPT.
JUN 14 1993
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

Residential Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Fund shall be established under the supervision and direction of the board for the receipt of fees under this chapter, such fees to be appropriated by the Board of Supervisors for the operation of the board.

(h) Subject to the budgetary and fiscal limitations of the Charter, each member shall be paid $75 per Commission meeting attended if the meeting lasts for 6 hours or more in a single 24 hour period. The Commission shall adopt rules to allow for payment of an equitable portion of this per diem if a meeting lasts less than six hours. Total per diem shall not exceed $750 per month. In addition, each member may receive reimbursement for actual expenses incurred in the course and scope of the member's duties.

SEC. 37.7. Certification of Rental Increases for Capital Improvements, Rehabilitation and Energy Conservation Measures.

(a) Authority. In accordance with such guidelines as the Board shall establish, the Board and designated hearing officers shall have the authority to conduct hearings in order to certify rental increases to the extent necessary to amortize the cost of capital improvements, rehabilitation, and energy conservation measures. Costs determined to be attributable to such work shall be amortized over a period which is fair and reasonable for the type and the extent of the work and which will provide an

incentive to landlords to maintain, improve and renovate their properties while at the same time protecting tenants from excessive rent increases. Costs attributable to routine repair and maintenance shall not be certified.

(b) Requirements for Certification. The Board and designated hearing officers may only certify the costs of capital improvements, rehabilitation, and energy conservation measures where the following criteria are met:

(1) The landlord completed capital improvements or rehabilitation on or after April 15, 1979, or the landlord completed installation of energy conservation measures on or after July 24, 1982 and has filed a proof of compliance with the Bureau of Building Inspection in accordance with the requirements of Section 1207(d) of the Housing Code;

(2) The landlord has not yet increased the rent or rents to reflect the cost of said work;

(3) The landlord has not been compensated for the work by insurance proceeds;

(4) The building is not subject to a RAP loan in a RAP area designated prior to July 1, 1977.

(5) The landlord files the certification petition no later than five (5) years after the work has been completed.

(c) Amortization and Cost Allocation. The Board shall establish amortization periods and cost allocation formulas.

/ / /

Costs shall be allocated to each unit according to the benefit of the work attributable to such unit.

(d) Estimator. The Board or its Executive ((Secretary)) Director may hire an estimator where an expert appraisal is required.

(e) Filing Fee. The Board shall establish a filing fee based upon the cost of the capital improvement, rehabilitation, or energy conservation measures being reviewed. Such fees will pay for the costs of an estimator. These fees shall be deposited in the Residential Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Fund pursuant to Section 10.117-88 of this code.

(f) Application Procedure.

(1) Filing. Landlords who seek to pass through the costs of capital improvements, rehabilitation, or energy conservation measures must file an application on a form prescribed by the board. The application shall be accompanied by such supporting materials as the Board shall prescribe. All applications must be submitted with the filing fee established by the board.

(2) Filing Date. Applications must be filed prior to the mailing or delivery of legal notice of a rent increase to the tenants of units for which the landlord seeks certification and in no event more than five (5) years after the work has been completed.

/ / /

(3) Effect of Filing Application. Upon the filing of the application, the requested increases will be inoperative until such time as the hearing officer makes findings of fact at the conclusion of the certification hearing.

(4) Notice to Parties. The Board shall calendar the application for hearing before a designated hearing officer and shall give written notice of the date to the parties at least 10 days prior to the hearing.

(g) Certification Hearings.

(1) Time of Hearing. The hearing shall be held within 45 days of the filing of the application.

(2) Consolidation. To the greatest extent possible, certification hearings with respect to a given building shall be consolidated. Where a landlord and/or tenant has filed a petition for hearing based upon the grounds and under the procedure set forth in Section 37.8, the Board may, in its discretion, consolidate certification hearings with hearings on Section 37.8 petitions.

(3) Conduct of Hearing. The hearing shall be conducted by a hearing officer designated by the Board. Both parties may offer such documents, testimony, written declarations or other evidence as may be pertinent to the proceedings. Burden of proof is on the landlord. A record of the proceedings must be maintained for purposes of appeal.

/ / /

(4) Determination of the Hearing Officer. In accordance with the Board's amortization schedules and cost allocation formulas, the hearing officer shall make findings as to whether or not the proposed rent increases are justified based upon the following considerations:

(A) The application and its supporting documentation;

(B) Evidence presented at the hearing establishing both the extent and the cost of the work performed;

(C) Estimator's report, where such report has been prepared; and

(D) Any other such relevant factors as the board shall specify in Rules and Regulations.

(5) Findings of Fact. The hearing officer shall make written findings of fact, copies of which shall be mailed within 30 days of the hearing.

(6) Payment or Refund of Rents to Implement Certification Decision. If the hearing officer finds that all or any portion of the heretofore inoperative rent increase is justified, the tenant shall be ordered to pay the landlord that amount. If the tenant has paid an amount to the landlord which the hearing officer finds unjustified, the hearing officer shall order the landlord to reimburse the tenant said amount.

(7) Finality of Hearing Officer's Decision. The decision of the hearing officer shall be final unless the Board

vacates his or her decision on appeal.

(8) Appeals. Either party may file an appeal of the hearing officer's decision with the Board. Such appeals are governed by Section 37.8(f) below.

SEC. 37.8. Arbitration of Rental Increase Adjustments.

(a) Authority of Board and Hearing Officers. In accordance with such guidelines as the Board shall establish, the Board and designated hearing officers shall have the authority to arbitrate rental increase adjustments and to administer the rent increase protest procedures with respect to RAP rental units as set forth in Chapter 32 of the San Francisco Administrative Code.

(b) Request for Arbitration.

(1) Landlords. Landlords who seek to impose rent increases which exceed the limitations set forth in Section 37.3(a) above must request an arbitration hearing as set forth in this section. The burden of proof is on the landlord.

(2) Tenants.

(A) Notwithstanding Section 37.3, tenants of non-RAP rental units and tenants of RAP rental units in areas designated on or after July 1, 1977 may request arbitration hearings where a landlord has substantially decreased services without a corresponding reduction in rent and/or has failed to perform ordinary repair and maintenance under state or local law and/or has failed to provide the tenant with a clear explanation

of the current charges for gas and electricity passed through to the tenant and/or imposed a nonconforming rent increase which is null and void. The burden of proof is on the tenant.

(B) Tenants of RAP rental units in areas designated prior to July 1, 1977 may petition for a hearing where the landlord has noticed an increase which exceeds the limitations set forth in Section 32.73 of the San Francisco Administrative Code. After a vacancy has occurred in a RAP rental unit in said areas, a new tenant of said unit may petition for a hearing where the landlord has demanded and/or received a rent for that unit which exceeds the rent increase limitation set forth in Section 32.73 of the San Francisco Administrative Code. The burden of proof is on the landlord.

(c) Procedure for Landlord Petitioners.

(1) Filing. The request for arbitration must be filed on a petition form prescribed by the Board and shall be accompanied by such supporting material as the Board shall prescribe, including but not limited to, justification for the proposed rental increase.

(2) Filing Date. The petition must be filed prior to the mailing or delivering to the tenant or tenants legal notice of the rental increase exceeding the limitations as defined in Section 37.3.

(3) Effect of Timely Filing of Petition. Provided a completed petition is timely filed, that portion of the requested

rental increase which exceeds the limitations set forth in Section 37.3 and has not been certified as a justifiable increase in accordance with Section 37.7 is inoperative until such time as the hearing officer makes findings of fact at the conclusion of the arbitration hearing.

(4) Notice to Parties. The Board shall calendar the petition for hearing before a designated hearing officer and shall give written notice of the date to the parties at least ten (10) days prior to the hearing.

(d) Procedure for Tenant Petitioners.

(1) Filing; Limitation. The request for arbitration must be filed on a petition form prescribed by the Board and must be accompanied by such supporting material as the Board shall prescribe, including but not limited to, a copy of the landlord's notice of rent increase. If the tenant petitioner has received certification findings regarding his rental unit in accordance with 37.7, such findings must accompany the petition. If the tenant petitioner has received a notification from the Chief Administrative Officer with respect to base rent and amortization of a RAP loan, such notification must accompany the petition. Tenant petitions regarding the gas and electricity passthrough must be filed within one year of the effective date of the passthrough or within one year of the date the passthrough was required to be recalculated pursuant to rules and regulations promulgated by the Board.

(2) Notice to Parties. The Board shall calendar the petition for hearing before a designated hearing officer and shall give written notice of the date to the parties at least ten (10) days prior to the hearing. Responses to a petition for hearing may be submitted in writing.

(e) Hearings.

(1) Time of Hearing. The hearing must be held within forty-five (45) days of the filing of the petition. The level of housing services provided to tenants' rental units shall not be decreased during the period between the filing of the petition and the conclusion of the hearing.

(2) Consolidation. To the greatest extent possible, hearings with respect to a given building shall be consolidated.

(3) Conduct of Hearing. The hearing shall be conducted by a hearing officer designated by the Board. Both parties may offer such documents, testimony, written declarations or other evidence as may be pertinent to the proceedings. A record of the proceedings must be maintained for purposes of appeal.

(4) Determination of the Hearing Officer: Rental Units. Based upon the evidence presented at the hearing and upon such relevant factors as the Board shall determine, the hearing officer shall make findings as to whether or not the landlord's proposed rental increase exceeding the limitations set forth in Section 37.3 is justified or whether or not the landlord has

effected a rent increase through a reduction in services or has failed to perform ordinary repair and maintenance as required by state or local law. In making such findings, the hearing officer shall take into consideration the following factors:

(A) Increases or decreases in operating and maintenance expenses, including, but not limited to, real estate taxes, sewer service charges, janitorial service, refuse removal, elevator service, security system, and debt service; provided however, when a unit is purchased after the effective date of this ordinance, and this purchase occurs within two (2) years of the date of the previous purchase, consideration shall not be given to that portion of increased debt service which has resulted from a selling price which exceeds the seller's purchase price by more than the percentage increase in the "Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers for the San Francisco-Oakland Metropolitan Area, U.S. Department of Labor" between the date of previous purchase and the date of the current sale, plus the cost of capital improvements or rehabilitation work made or performed by the seller.

(B) The past history of increases in the rent for the unit and the comparison of the rent for the unit with rents for comparable units in the same general area.

(C) Any findings which have been made pursuant to Section 37.7 with respect to the unit.

/ / /

(D) Failure to perform ordinary repair, replacement and maintenance in compliance with applicable state and local law.

(E) Any other such relevant factors as the Board shall specify in rules and regulations.

(5) Determination of the Hearing Officer: RAP Rental Units.

(A) Rap Rental units in RAP areas designated prior to July 1, 1977. The hearing officer shall make findings as to whether or not the noticed or proposed rental increase exceeds the rent increase limitations set forth in Section 32.73 of the San Francisco Administrative Code. In making such findings, the hearing officer shall apply the rent increase limitations set forth in Chapter 32 of the San Francisco Administrative Code and all rules and regulations promulgated pursuant thereto. The hearing officer shall consider the evidence presented at the hearing. The burden of proof shall be on the landlord.

(B) Rap rental units in RAP areas designated on or after July 1, 1977. The hearing officer shall make findings with respect to rent increases exceeding the limitations as set forth in Section 37.3 of this chapter. In making such findings, the hearing officer shall take into consideration the factors set forth in subsection (4) above and shall consider evidence presented at the hearing. The burden of proof is on the landlord.

(6) Findings of Fact. The hearing officer shall make written findings of fact, copies of which shall be mailed to the

parties within 30 days of the hearing.

(7) Payment or Refund of Rents to Implement Arbitration Decision. Upon finding that all or any portion of the rent increase is or is not justified, or that any nonconforming rent increase is null and void, the hearing officer may order payment or refund of all or a portion of that cumulative amount within fifteen (15) days of the mailing of the findings of fact or may order the amount added to or offset against future rents; provided, however, that any such order shall be stayed if an appeal is timely filed by the aggrieved party. The hearing officer may order refunds of rent increases which are null and void for no more than the three-year period preceding the date of the filing of a landlord or tenant petition, plus the period between the date of filing and the date of the hearing officer's decision. In any case, calculation of rent overpayments and re-setting of the lawful base rent shall be based on a determination of the validity of all rent increases imposed since April 1, 1982, in accordance with Sections 37.3(b)(5) and 37.3(a)(2) above.

5/17/93

jcl

(8) Finality of Hearing Officer's Decision. The decision of the hearing officer shall be final unless the Board vacates his decision on appeal.

(f) Appeals.

(1) Time and Manner. Any appeal to the Board from the determination of the hearing officer must be made within fifteen

(15) calendar days of the mailing of the findings of fact unless such time limit is extended by the board upon a showing of good cause. The appeal shall be in writing and must state why appellant believes there was either error or abuse of discretion on the part of the hearing officer. The filing of an appeal will stay only that portion of any hearing officer's decision which permits payment, refund, offsetting or adding rent.

(2) Record on Appeal. Upon receipt of an appeal, the entire administrative record of the matter, including the appeal, shall be filed with the Board.

(3) Appeals. The Board shall, in its discretion, hear appeals. In deciding whether or not to hear a given appeal, the board shall consider, among other factors, fairness to the parties, hardship to either party, and promoting the policies and purposes of this chapter, in addition to any written comments submitted by the hearing officer whose decision is being challenged. The Board may also review other material from the administrative record of the matter as it deems necessary. A vote of three (3) members shall be required in order for an appeal to be heard.

(4) Remand to Hearing Officer without Appeal Hearing. In those cases where the Board is able to determine on the basis of the documents before it that the hearing officer has erred, the board may remand the case for further hearing in accordance with its instructions without conducting an appeal hearing. Both

parties shall be notified as to the time of the re-hearing, which shall be conducted within thirty (30) days of remanding by the board. In those cases where the board is able to determine on the basis of the documents before it that the hearing officer's findings contain numerical or clerical inaccuracies, or require clarification, the board may continue the hearing for purposes of re-referring the case to said hearing officer in order to correct the findings.

(5) Time of Appeal Hearing; Notice to Parties. Appeals accepted by the board shall be heard within forty-five (45) days of the filing of an appeal. Within thirty (30) days of the filing of an appeal, both parties shall be notified in writing as to whether or not the appeal has been accepted. If the appeal has been accepted, the notice shall state the time of the hearing and the nature of the hearing. Such notice must be mailed at least ten (10) days prior to the hearing.

(6) Appeal Hearing; Decision of the Board. At the appeal hearing, both appellant and respondent shall have an opportunity to present oral testimony and written documents in support of their positions. After such hearing and after any further investigation which the board may deem necessary the board may, upon hearing the appeal, affirm, reverse or modify the hearing officer's decision or may remand the case for further hearing in accordance with its findings. The board's decision must be rendered within forty-five (45) days of the hearing and

the parties must be notified of such decision.

(7) Notification of the Parties. In accordance with item (6) above, parties shall receive written notice of the decision. The notice shall state that this decision is final.

(8) Effective Date of Appeal Decisions. Appeal decisions are effective on the date mailed to the parties; provided, however, that that portion of any decision which orders payment, refund, offsetting or adding rent shall become effective thirty (30) calendar days after it is mailed to the parties unless a stay of execution is granted by a court of competent jurisdiction.

(9) Limitation of Actions. A landlord or tenant aggrieved by any decision of the Board must seek judicial review within ninety (90) calendar days of the date of mailing of the decision.

SEC. 37.11A. Civil Actions.

Whenever a landlord charges a tenant a rent which exceeds the limitations set forth in this chapter, or retaliates against a tenant for the exercise of any rights under this chapter, the tenant may institute a civil proceeding for money damages; provided, however, that any monetary award for a rent increase which is null and void pursuant to Section 37.3(b)(5) shall be limited to a refund of rent overpayments made during the three year period preceding the date of filing of the action, plus the period between the date of filing and the date of court's order,

5/17/93
jcl

In any case, calculation of rent overpayments and re-setting of the lawful base rent shall be based on a determination of the validity of all rent increases imposed since April 1, 1982, in accordance with Sections 37.3(b)(5) and 37.3(a)(2) above. The prevailing party in any civil action brought under this section shall be entitled to recover reasonable attorneys' fees and costs. The remedy available under this section shall be in addition to any other existing remedies which may be available to the tenant.

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

LOUISE H. RENNE, City Attorney

By: Irene Dick
Deputy City Attorney

Board of Supervisors, San Francisco

Passed for Second Reading	§	Finally Passed
	§	
May 17, 1993	§	May 24, 1993
	§	
	§	
Ayes: Supervisors Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Kaufman Kennedy Maher Migden Shelley	§	Ayes: Supervisors Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Kennedy Migden Shelley
	§	
Absent: Supervisors Achtenberg Hsieh	§	Absent: Supervisors Achtenberg Maher

I hereby certify that the foregoing ordinance was finally passed by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco

Jean Lum
Acting Clerk

File No.
109-93-1

MAY 28 1993
Date Approved

Frank M. Jordan
Mayor

FILE NO. 114-93-3 ORDINANCE NO. 163-93

(BUILDING CODE BOILER INSPECTION)

AMENDING PART II, CHAPTER 1 OF THE SAN FRANCISCO MUNICIPAL CODE (BUILDING CODE) BY ADDING NEW SECTION 328 GOVERNING BOILER INSPECTION

Be it ordained by the people of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. Part II, Chapter 1, of the San Francisco Municipal Code (Building Code) is hereby amended by adopting Section 328 to read as follows:

BOILERS

Sec. 328. (a) **General.** Low pressure boilers shall comply with the provisions of this section unless specifically exempted herein. Nothing contained elsewhere in this code shall be construed as evidence of proper performance or adequate capacity of any of these appliances. Appliances defined as high-pressure boilers are exempt from this Section.

(b) **Permit to Install or Replace.** It shall be unlawful for any person to install, or replace, a low pressure boiler unless a Permit to Install is obtained from the Bureau, and the permit fee in Section 330.4 has been paid.

In addition to the Permit to Install or Replace, a separate Building Permit at the minimum fee per Section 330.1 -- New Construction and Alteration Permit Fees -- shall be required for a new boiler installation except where a building permit has been issued which included such boiler installation.

(c) **Permit to Operate.** When the initial installation, or replacement, of a boiler is found by the Bureau to be in compliance with the applicable Codes, or when an existing boiler has undergone

an inspection or reinspection by personnel, described in Subsection (d) below, and is found to be in compliance with standards acceptable to the Department of Public Works, a Permit to Operate will be issued by the Superintendent. The issued Permit to Operate shall be posted by the inspector in a readily accessible location in the boiler area.

(d) **Renewal of Permit to Operate.** A Permit to Operate shall be valid for one year and shall be renewed annually. Each appliance must be reinspected before the end of the current Permit period. When the reinspection finds that the installation is in compliance with applicable regulations, the Permit to Operate shall be renewed upon the submittal of acceptable inspection documentation and the payment of an inspection renewal fee. The Superintendent shall issue a renewal Permit to Operate which shall be posted with the original Permit to Operate.

When the reinspection finds that repairs are required, such repairs shall be made within 30 days from the filing date of the written inspection repair notice by the certified agency. If the required repairs constitute an immediate life safety hazard, the repairs or corrective action shall be made upon notice to the Bureau of Building Inspection. A copy of the repair notice shall be filed with the Bureau of Building Inspection. An extension of the repair time limit may be granted by the Superintendent except where an immediate life or health hazard exists.

Reinspections may be made by a California State licensed Boiler Contractor, or by a certified employee of an insurance company, provided the agency or company submits a copy of each inspection report and a copy of the first data for the appliance to the Bureau.

(e) **Permit Fees.** The applicant for the Permit to Install, together with the initial Permit to Operate, shall be charged a fee based on the schedule in Section 330.4 -- Boiler Permit Fee Schedule. The fee for renewal of a Permit to Operate shall be based on the same schedule. Such fee shall be paid whether or not a Permit to Operate is issued. All fees shall be paid at the time of application for permits. Any additional fees billed will be increased to twice the billed amount when payment

DOCUMENTS DEPT.
JUN 14 1993
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

is not received by the Bureau within 30 days of billing. Failure to pay required fees will result in cancellation of the issued Permit to Operate.

(f) Violations. 1. Operating without a permit. Any person owning or having the custody, management or operation of a boiler, who operates it without a permit issued pursuant to this Code, or who resists or opposes the execution of any of the provisions of this Code, or any order of the Superintendent or Director of Public Works, made pursuant to this Code, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction shall be subject to a fine or by imprisonment or by both. When the Superintendent is made aware of any boiler operating without a valid Permit to Operate, the Superintendent shall cause the operation to be stopped until an inspection has been made, the applicable fees paid, and a Permit to Operate issued. Applicable penalty fees shall be in effect and assessed starting as of the date one year following the effective date of this Ordinance. The installation or operation of a boiler without a valid permit shall be subject to the investigation fee in Section 332.3.

2. Operating when repairs are not made. When inspection or reinspection finds that repairs are required, and the repairs are not completed nor is an extension issued, the Superintendent will issue a Notice of Apparent Violation 30-days following receipt of the required written inspection repair notice by the certified inspecting agency. In response to the Notice of Apparent Violation, the boiler owner shall provide written evidence within ten days to the Superintendent indicating compliance with the Code. If repairs are not completed, or a response from the owner is not received, or a Permit to Operate not issued within 10 days of the mailing of the Notice of Apparent Violation, a Notice of Violation shall be issued. If repairs are not completed nor a Permit to Operate issued within 10 days following the mailing of the Notice of Violation, the Superintendent shall call an Administrative Hearing to determine if the boiler should be operated, be repaired, be replaced, or be removed. All resulting orders will be referred to the Code Enforcement Division of the Bureau

of Building Inspection for appropriate action. Each Notice of Violation issued shall be subject to the Fees as set forth in Sec. 330.4 -- Notice of Violation -- and such fees shall be paid prior to issuance of the Permit to Operate. Following the Hearing where the repairs are determined to be justified, the boiler owner must complete the repairs in the stipulated time in the Hearing or be subject to a penalty of $100.00 per day for each day beyond the time stipulated at the hearing.

3. Mismanagement of boilers. Every person having charge of any appliance regulated by this Section who willfully, or from ignorance of operating procedures or from gross neglect, creates, or allows to be created, such an undue quantity of pressure as to cause the boiler to burst or break, or to cause any accident whereby human life is endangered, is guilty of a misdemeanor. When a death is caused by such an incident, an investigation will be made and the results will be referred to the District Attorney's Office.

(g) Permits Revoked. For cause, the Superintendent may, in writing, suspend or revoke a permit issued under the provisions of this Code Section whenever the permit has been issued in error, or on the basis of incorrect information supplied, incorrect fees paid, fees not paid, or in violation of any ordinance, regulation or any provision of this Code.

(h) Technical Requirements. See Chapter 21 of the Mechanical Code.

(i) **Exempt Installations.** See Chapter 21 of the Mechanical Code.

Effective Date. This Section 328 to become effective July 1, 1993.

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

LOUISE H. RENNE

City Attorney

By Noreen Ambrose

Deputy City Attorney

RECOMMENDED:

Vitaly B. Troyan

Deputy Director for

Public Services

DESCRIPTION APPROVED:

L. L. Litchfield

Superintendent, Bureau of

Building Inspection

APPROVED:

John E. Cribbs

Director of Public Works

APPROVED:

Rudolf Nothernberg

Chief Administrative Officer

Board of Supervisors, San Francisco

Passed for Second Reading	Finally Passed
May 17, 1993	May 24, 1993
Ayes: Supervisors Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Kaufman Kennedy Maher Migden Shelley	Ayes: Supervisors Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Kennedy Migden Shelley
Absent: Supervisors Achtenberg Hsieh	Absent: Supervisors Achtenberg Maher

I hereby certify that the foregoing ordinance was finally passed by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco

Joan Lund

Acting Clerk

File No.
114-93-3

MAY 28 1993

Date Approved

Frank M. Jordan

Mayor

FILE NO. 114-93-4 ORDINANCE NO. 164-93

[BBI FEE SCHEDULE]

AMENDING PART II, CHAPTER 1, OF THE SAN FRANCISCO MUNICIPAL CODE (BUILDING CODE) BY AMENDING SECTION 330.4 TO PROVIDE NEW FEES COMMENSURATE WITH THE NEW CODE SECTION 328.

Note: Additions or substitutions are underlined; deletions are indicated by ((double parentheses)).

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. Part II, Chapter 1, of the San Francisco Municipal Code (Building Code) is hereby amended by amending Section 330.4 to read as follows:

Boiler Permit Fee Schedule

Sec. 330.4

Permit to Install or Replace	((($108.00))	$190.00
((Alteration Permit	$54.00))	
Permit to Operate (Certificate Issued)	((($26.00))	$35.00
Renew((al)) Permit to Operate (Certificate Issued)	((($26.00))	$35.00
Replacement of Issued Permit to Operate		$35.00
Notice of Apparent Violation		(No Fee)
Notice of Violation		$100.00
Administrative Hearing		$500.00

Connection to Utility Company Provided Steam

(Includes Permit to Operate) $35.00

Renewal Required

1. ((High)) Low Pressure Boiler every 12 months.

((2. Low Pressure Boiler every 24 months.))

((3.)) 2. Water Heaters ((and water tanks)) when alteration or replacement permits are issued.

Effective Date. The revised Section 330.4 to become effective July 1, 1993.

APPROVED AS TO FORM:
LOUISE H. RENNE
City Attorney

By Noreen Ambrose
Deputy City Attorney

RECOMMENDED:

Vitaly B. Troyan
Deputy Director for
Public Services

DESCRIPTION APPROVED:

L. L. Litchfield
Superintendent, Bureau of
Building Inspection

APPROVED:

John E. Cribbs
Director of Public Works

APPROVED:

Rudolf Nothenberg
Chief Administrative Officer

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

DOCUMENTS DEPT
JUN 14 1993
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

Board of Supervisors, San Francisco

Passed for Second Reading	$	Finally Passed
	$	
May 17, 1993	$	May 24, 1993
	$	
	$	
Ayes: Supervisors Alioto Bierman	$	Ayes: Supervisors Alioto Bierman
Conroy Hallinan Kaufman Kennedy	$	Conroy Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman
Maher Migden Shelley	$	Kennedy Migden Shelley
	$	
Absent: Supervisors Achtenberg	$	Absent: Supervisors Achtenberg
Hsieh	$	Maher

I hereby certify that the foregoing ordinance was finally passed by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco

Jean Lum
Acting Clerk

MAY 28 1993
Date Approved

Frank M. Jordan
Mayor

File No.
114-93-4

(Places of Entertainment)

AMENDING CHAPTER VIII, PART II, ARTICLE 15.1 OF THE SAN FRANCISCO MUNICIPAL CODE (POLICE CODE) BY AMENDING SECTIONS 1060 AND 1060.22 THEREOF RELATING TO PERMIT AND FEE REQUIREMENTS FOR PLACES OFFERING INFORMAL ENTERTAINMENT.

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by underlining; deletions are indicated by ((double parentheses)).

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. Chapter VIII, Part II, Article 15.1 is hereby amended by amending Sections 1060 and 1060.22 to read as follows:

SEC. 1060. DEFINITIONS.

For the purposes of this Article, the following words and phrases shall mean and include:

(a) "Place of entertainment." Every premises to which patrons or members are admitted which serves food, beverages, or food and beverages, including but not limited to alcoholic beverages, for consumption on the premises and wherein entertainment as defined in Subsections (b), (c), or (e) ((, or (f))) is furnished or occurs upon the premises.

(b) "Entertainment." Any act, play, review, pantomime, scene, song, dance act, song and dance act, or poetry recitation, conducted or participated in by any professional entertainer in or upon any premises to which patrons or members are admitted.

"Entertainment," in addition, is defined to mean and include the playing upon or use by any professional entertainer of any instrument that is capable of or can be used to produce musical sounds or percussion sounds, including but not limited to, reed, brass, percussion or string-like instruments, or recorded music presented by a live disc jockey on the premises.

(c) "Entertainment," Continued. "Entertainment" also includes a fashion or style show in which the models are professional entertainers, except when conducted by a bona fide nonprofit club or organization as a part of the social activities of such club or organization, and when conducted solely as a fundraising activity for charitable purposes.

(d) "Professional Entertainer." A person who is compensated for his or her performance. ((engages in the presentation of entertainment for livelihhod or gain.))

(e) "Entertainment," Continued; Exhibition of Human Body. "Entertainment" also includes the act of any female professional entertainer, while visible to any customer, who exposes the breast or employs any device or covering which is intended to simulate the breast, or wears any type of clothing so that the breast may be observed.

(((f) "Informal Entertainment." Any play, act, review, pantomime, scene, song, dance act, song and dance act, or poetry

DOCUMENTS DEPT
JUN 14 1993
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

recitation, conducted or participated in by any nonprofessional person or persons in or upon any premises to which patrons or members are admitted.))

(f) (((g))) "Person." Any person, individual, firm, partnership, joint venture, association, social club, fraternal organization, joint stock company, corporation, estate, trust, business trust, receiver, trustee, syndicate or any other group or combination acting as a unit excepting the United States of America, the State of California, and any political subdivision of either thereof.

(g) (((h))) "Operator." Any person operating a place of entertainment in the City and County of San Francisco, including, but not limited to, the owner or proprietor of such premises, lessee, sublessee, mortgagee in possession, permittee or any other person operating such place of entertainment or amusement.

(h) (((i))) "Bona Fide Nonprofit Club or Organization." Any fraternal, charitable, religious or benevolent, or any other nonprofit organization having a regular membership association primarily for mutual social, mental, political and civic welfare, to which admission is limited to members and guests and revenue accruing therefrom shall be used exclusively for the benevolent purposes of said organization and which organization or agency is exempt from taxation under the Internal Revenue laws of the United States as a bona fida fraternal, charitable, religious, benevolent or nonprofit organization.

(i) (((j))) 'Admission Charge." Any charge for the right

or privilege to enter any place of entertainment including a minimum service charge, a cover charge or a charge made for the use of seats and tables, reserved or otherwise.

(j) (((k))) "Tax Collector." Tax Collector of the City and County of San Francisco.

SEC. 1060.22. LICENSE FEES. Every permittee who conducts, permits or assists in conducting or permitting any entertainment as defined in Sections 1060(b) ((,)) and (c) ((and (f))) to be shown, staged, exhibited, or produced in or upon any permitted premise shall pay to the Tax Collector an annual license fee, payable in advance.

The license fee prescribed in this Section is due and payable on a calendar year basis starting 120 days after the effective date of this Article, prorated with regard to the calendar year on a monthly basis. Fees for new licenses issued after the first day of January, 1971, or in any subsequent calendar year shall be prorated with regard to the calendar year on a monthly basis.

APPROVED AS TO FORM:
LOUISE H. RENNE, City Attorney

Deputy City Attorney

Board of Supervisors, San Francisco

Passed for Second Reading	§	Finally Passed
	§	
May 17, 1993	§	May 24, 1993
	§	
	§	
Ayes: Supervisors Alioto Bierman	§	Ayes: Supervisors Alioto Bierman
Conroy Hallinan Kaufman Kennedy	§	Conroy Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman
Maher Migden Shelley	§	Kennedy Migden Shelley
	§	
Absent: Supervisors Achtenberg	§	Absent: Supervisors Achtenberg
Hsieh	§	Maher

I hereby certify that the foregoing ordinance was finally passed by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco

Jean Lum
Acting Clerk

File No.
121-93-3

MAY 28 1993
Date Approved

Frank M. Jordan
Mayor

Amendment of the whole
5/12/93

FILE NO. 127-93-1 ORDINANCE NO 166-93

[Stadium Operator Admission Tax]

AMENDING PART III, SAN FRANCISCO MUNICIPAL CODE, BY AMENDING SECTION 802 THEREOF, INCREASING THE RATE OF THE STADIUM ADMISSION TAX FROM 50¢ TO $1.50 ON TICKETS SOLD AT $25.02 OR MORE.

Note: Additions or substitutions are underlined; deletions are in ((double parenthesis)).

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. Part III, San Francisco Municipal Code, is hereby amended by amending Section 802 thereof, to read as follows:

SEC. 802. IMPOSITION AND AMOUND OF STADIUM OPERATOR ADMISSION TAX. There is hereby imposed a tax on any operator of athletic contests, exhibitions and other special events in an amount equivalent to 50¢ on each admission ticket with a value of $25.01 or less and one dollar and fifty cents ($1.50) on each admission ticket with a value of $25.02 or more sold for the right to occupy a seat or space in any stadium within the City and County of San Francisco for each event.

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

LOUISE H. RENNE, City Attorney

By: Deputy City Attorney

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS 4/20/93

Board of Supervisors, San Francisco

Passed for Second Reading	Finally Passed
May 17, 1993	May 24, 1993
Ayes: Supervisors Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Kaufman Kennedy Maher Migden Shelley	Ayes: Supervisors Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Kennedy Migden Shelley
Absent: Supervisors Achtenberg Hsieh	Absent: Supervisors Achtenberg Maher

I hereby certify that the foregoing ordinance was finally passed by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco

Acting Clerk

File No. 127-93-1

MAY 28 1993

Date Approved

Mayor

DOCUMENTS DEPT
JUN 14 1993
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

As amended in committee
May 19, 1993.

FILE NO. 97-93-23 ORDINANCE NO. 167-93

(Parking and Traffic)

AMENDING CHAPTER I OF THE SAN FRANCISCO ADMINISTRATIVE CODE BY ADDING SECTION 1.41 THEREOF, RELATING TO HOLD HARMLESS AGREEMENTS BETWEEN THE DEPARTMENT OF PARKING AND TRAFFIC AND GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES FOR RECEIPT OF TRANSPORTATION GRANT FUNDS.

Note: All language is new.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. Chapter I of the San Francisco Administrative code is hereby amended by adding Section 1.41 thereof to read as follows:

SEC. 1.41 HOLD HARMLESS AGREEMENTS BETWEEN THE DEPARTMENT OF PARKING AND TRAFFIC AND GOVERNMENTAL ENTITIES FOR RECEIPT OF TRANSPORTATION GRANT FUNDS. The Department of Parking and Traffic is hereby authorized to enter into hold harmless agreements, approved as to form by the City Attorney, with state and federal governmental entities for the purpose of obtaining transportation grant funds from such entities to pay the costs of transportation improvements within the City and County. Any hold harmless agreements which are unusual or significantly different from the standard provision, as determined by the City Attorney, would be separately approved by the Board of Supervisors.

LOUISE H. RENNE
City Attorney

By: Lawrence A. Wayte
LAWRENCE A. WAYTE
Deputy City Attorney

John E. Newlin
JOHN E. NEWLIN
Executive Director
Department of Parking and Traffic

mlr
5/19

Board of Supervisors, San Francisco

Passed for Second Reading	Finally Passed
May 24, 1993	June 1, 1993
Ayes: Supervisors Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Kennedy Migden Shelley	Ayes: Supervisors Achtenberg Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Migden Shelley
Absent: Supervisors Achtenberg Maher	Absent: Supervisors Kennedy Maher

I hereby certify that the foregoing ordinance was finally passed by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco

John L. Taylor
Clerk

File No.
97-93-23

JUN 11 1993
Date Approved

Frank M. Jordan
Mayor

DOCUMENTS DEPT.
JUL 01 1993
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

FILE NO. 27-93-9 ORDINANCE NO. 168-93

(Airport - Lease Modifications)

APPROVING MODIFICATION NO. 6 OF LEASE AND USE AGREEMENT BETWEEN USAIR, INC. AND CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, ACTING BY AND THROUGH ITS AIRPORTS COMMISSION.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. Pursuant to Section 7.402-1 of the Charter, the Board of Supervisors hereby approves Modification No. 6 of the Lease and Use Agreement between USAir, Inc. and the City and County of San Francisco, acting by and through its Airports Commission, copies of which Modification is contained in Board of Supervisors' file number 27-93-9.

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

LOUISE H. RENNE

City Attorney

By [signature]
Deputy City Attorney

2950P

Board of Supervisors, San Francisco

Passed for Second Reading	Finally Passed
May 24, 1993	June 1, 1993
Ayes: Supervisors Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Kennedy Migden Shelley	Ayes: Supervisors Achtenberg Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Migden Shelley
Absent: Supervisors Achtenberg Maher	Absent: Supervisors Kennedy Maher

I hereby certify that the foregoing ordinance was finally passed by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco

[signature]
Clerk

JUN 11 1993

File No.
27-93-9

Date Approved

[signature]
Mayor

DOCUMENTS DEPT.
JUL 01 1993
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

FILE NO. 45-93-23

ORDINANCE NO. 169-93

RO #92241

AUTHORIZATION SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION OF CYNTHIA Y. CANTERO v. OFFICER WILLIS CASEY, AND CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO FOR $12,000.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section I. The City Attorney is hereby authorized to settle the action entitled CYNTHIA Y. CANTERO v. OFFICER WILLIS CASEY, AND CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, United States District Court No. C 91-1764, by the payment of $12,000.

APPROVED AS TO FORM AND RECOMMENDED:

LOUISE A. RENNE
City Attorney

PATRICK J. MAHONEY
Chief Trial Deputy

RECOMMENDED:

SAN FRANCISCO POLICE DEPARTMENT

ANTHONY RIBERA
Chief of Police

FUNDS AVAILABLE:

CONTROLLER

01 001 97 09 38
309781 1450 $12,000.00

APR 28 1993

APPROVED:

SAN FRANCISCO POLICE COMMISSION

SECRETARY

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

CC

Board of Supervisors, San Francisco

Passed for Second Reading	Finally Passed
May 24, 1993	June 1, 1993
Ayes: Supervisors Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Kennedy Migden Shelley	Ayes: Supervisors Achtenberg Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Migden Shelley
Absent: Supervisors Achtenberg Maher	Absent: Supervisors Kennedy Maher

I hereby certify that the foregoing ordinance was finally passed by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco

Clerk

File No.
45-93-23

JUN 11 1993

Date Approved

Mayor

DOCUMENTS DEPT.
JUL 01 1993
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

As amended in committee
May 19, 1993.

FILE NO. 45-93-24 ORDINANCE 170-93

RO #92240

[SETTLEMENT OF LAWSUIT]

AUTHORIZING SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION OF BETTINA HEATH AGAINST JUVENILE HALL, YOUTH GUIDANCE CENTER, JUVENILE COURT, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, JAMES SUTRO, AND DOES I THROUGH XX, INCLUSIVE for ~~$85,500~~ $90,500.

mlr 5/19

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section I. The City Attorney is hereby authorized to settle the action entitled "BETTINA HEATH v. JUVENILE HALL, ET AL.," Superior Court No. 919454, by the payment of $85,500, plus interest on the amount of ~~$85,000~~ $90,500, at the rate of 7%, from April 29, 1993 until this ordinance is signed by the Mayor.

mlr 5/19

APPROVED AS TO FORM
AND RECOMMENDED:

LOUISE H. RENNE
City Attorney

PATRICK J. MAHONEY
Chief Trial Deputy

RECOMMENDED:

JUVENILE COURT/YOUTH GUIDANCE CENTER

FRED E. JORDAN, JR.
Chief Probation Officer

FUNDS AVAILABLE:

EDWARD HARRINGTON
Controller

01 001 97 09 12
309765 1450 $85,500.00

APR 28 1993

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Board of Supervisors, San Francisco

Passed for Second Reading	Finally Passed
May 24, 1993	June 1, 1993
Ayes: Supervisors Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Kennedy Migden Shelley	Ayes: Supervisors Achtenberg Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Migden Shelley
Absent: Supervisors Achtenberg Maher	Absent: Supervisors Kennedy Maher

I hereby certify that the foregoing ordinance was finally passed by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco

John L. Taylor
Clerk

File No.
45-93-24

JUN 11 1993
Date Approved

Frank M. Jordan
Mayor

DOCUMENTS DEPT.
JUL 01 1993
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

FILE NO. 45-93-25

ORDINANCE NO. 171-93

RO #92254

AUTHORIZATION SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION OF MICHAEL QUEVILLON v. CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO FOR $13,500.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section I. The City Attorney is hereby authorized to settle the action entitled MICHAEL QUEVILLON v. CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, United States District Court No. C91-0691, by the payment of $13,500.

APPROVED AS TO FORM AND RECOMMENDED:

LOUISE A. RENNE
City Attorney

PATRICK J. MAHONEY
Chief Trial Deputy

RECOMMENDED:

SAN FRANCISCO SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT

MICHAEL HENNESSEY
Sheriff

FUNDS AVAILABLE:

CONTROLLER

MAY 04 1993

01 001 97 09 06
309740 1450 $13,500.00

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

CC

Board of Supervisors, San Francisco

Passed for Second Reading	Finally Passed
May 24, 1993	June 1, 1993
Ayes: Supervisors Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Kennedy Migden Shelley	Ayes: Supervisors Achtenberg Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Migden Shelley
Absent: Supervisors Achtenberg Maher	Absent: Supervisors Kennedy Maher

I hereby certify that the foregoing ordinance was finally passed by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco

John Taylor
Clerk

JUN 11 1993
Date Approved

Frank M. Jordan
Mayor

File No.
45-93-25

DOCUMENTS DEPT.
JUL 01 1993
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

FILE NO. 45-93-26 ORDINANCE NO 172-93

RO #92253

(SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION)

AUTHORIZING SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION OF GREAT WESTERN SAVINGS IN THE SUM OF $1,896,468.51 (CONSISTING OF $1,364,203.00 IN TAX REFUNDS AND $532,265.51 IN INTEREST) TO BE PAID IN TEN EQUAL ANNUAL INSTALLMENTS AT 7% PER ANNUM INTEREST OVER THE TEN-YEAR PERIOD.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. The City Attorney is hereby authorized to settle the action entitled Great Western Savings v. City and County of San Francisco, Superior Court No. 815-223, for refund of business taxes by the payment of $1,896.468.51 (consisting of $1,364,203.00 in tax refunds and $532,265.51 in interest) to be paid in ten equal annual installments at 7% per annum interest over the ten-year period.

APPROVED AS TO FORM AND RECOMMENDED:

LOUISE H. RENNE
City Attorney

PATRICK J. MAHONEY
Chief Trial Deputy

RECOMMENDED:

TAX COLLECTOR

THAD BROWN
Tax Collector

FUNDS AVAILABLE:

01 001 97 09 08
310441 1450 $1,896,468.51
MAY 04 1993

EDWARD M. HARRINGTON
Controller

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
14981-1

Board of Supervisors, San Francisco

Passed for Second Reading	Finally Passed
May 24, 1993	June 1, 1993
Ayes: Supervisors Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Kennedy Migden Shelley	Ayes: Supervisors Achtenberg Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Migden Shelley
Absent: Supervisors Achtenberg Maher	Absent: Supervisors Kennedy Maher

I hereby certify that the foregoing ordinance was finally passed by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco

Clerk

File No. 45-93-26

JUN 11 1993

Date Approved

Mayor

DOCUMENTS DEPT.
JUL 01 1993
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

CC

FILE NO. 45-93-27

ORDINANCE NO. 173-93

RO #92230

(SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION)

APPROVING THE SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION OF AMERICAN SAVINGS BANK, F.A. AND NEW WEST FEDERAL SAVINGS AND LOAN ASSOCIATION IN THE SUM OF $2,391,273.73 (CONSISTING OF $1,904,677.15 IN TAX REFUNDS AND $486,596.58 IN INTEREST) TO BE PAID IN TEN EQUAL ANNUAL INSTALLMENTS AT 7% PER ANNUM IN INTEREST AND OVER THE TEN-YEAR PERIOD.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. The City Attorney is hereby authorized to settle the action entitled American Savings Bank, F.A. and New West Federal Savings and Loan Association, Superior Court No. 941-478, for refund of business taxes by the payment of $2,391,273.73 (consisting of $1,904,677.15 in tax refunds and $486,596.58 in interest) to be paid in ten equal annual installments at 7% per annum in interest and over the ten-year period.

APPROVED AS TO FORM AND RECOMMENDED:

LOUISE H. RENNE
City Attorney

PATRICK J. MAHONEY
Chief Trial Deputy

RECOMMENDED:

TAX COLLECTOR

THAD BROWN
Tax Collector

FUNDS AVAILABLE: 01 001 97 09 08
310441 1450 $2,391,273.73

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
MAY 04 1993

EDWARD M. HARRINGTON
Controller

Board of Supervisors, San Francisco

Passed for Second Reading	Finally Passed
May 24, 1993	June 1, 1993
Ayes: Supervisors Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Kennedy Migden Shelley	Ayes: Supervisors Achtenberg Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Migden Shelley
Absent: Supervisors Achtenberg Maher	Absent: Supervisors Kennedy Maher

I hereby certify that the foregoing ordinance was finally passed by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco

Clerk

File No.
45-93-27

JUN 11 1993
Date Approved

Mayor

DOCUMENTS DEPT.
JUL 01 1993
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

FILE NO. 45-93-28 ORDINANCE NO. 174-93

RO #92229

(SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION)

AUTHORIZING SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION OF CITIBANK, A FEDERAL SAVINGS BANK (FORMERLY CITICORP SAVINGS) IN THE SUM OF $1,177,285.16 (CONSISTING OF $941,661.88 IN TAX REFUNDS AND $235,623.28 IN INTEREST) TO BE PAID IN TEN EQUAL ANNUAL INSTALLMENTS AT 7% PER ANNUM INTEREST OVER THE TEN-YEAR PERIOD.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. The City Attorney is hereby authorized to settle the action entitled Citibank, a Federal Savings Bank (formerly Citicorp Savings) v. City and County of San Francisco, Superior Court No. 948-296, for refund of business taxes by the payment of $1,177.285.16 (consisting of $941,661.88 in tax refunds and $235,623.28 in interest) to be paid in ten equal annual installments at 7% per annum interest over the ten-year period.

APPROVED AS TO FORM AND RECOMMENDED:

LOUISE H. RENNE
City Attorney

PATRICK J. MAHONEY
Chief Trial Deputy

RECOMMENDED:

TAX COLLECTOR

THAD BROWN
Tax Collector

FUNDS AVAILABLE: 01 001 97 09 08
310441 1450 $1,177,285.16

MAY 04 1993

EDWARD M. HARRINGTON
Controller

1498j-7

CC

Board of Supervisors, San Francisco

Passed for Second Reading	Finally Passed
May 24, 1993	June 1, 1993
Ayes: Supervisors Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Kennedy Migden Shelley	Ayes: Supervisors Achtenberg Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Migden Shelley
Absent: Supervisors Achtenberg Maher	Absent: Supervisors Kennedy Maher

I hereby certify that the foregoing ordinance was finally passed by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco

Clerk

File No. 45-93-28

JUN 11 1993

Date Approved

Mayor

DOCUMENTS DEPT.
JUL 01 1993
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

FILE NO. 45-93-29 ORDINANCE NO. 175-93

RO #92252

(SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION)

AUTHORIZING SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA FEDERAL SAVINGS & LOAN ASSOCIATION (FORMERLY SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA SAVINGS AND LOAN ASSOCIATION) IN THE SUM OF $172,975.57 (CONSISTING OF $134,842.96 IN TAX REFUNDS AND $38,132.61 IN INTEREST) TO BE PAID IN FOUR EQUAL ANNUAL INSTALLMENTS.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. The City Attorney is hereby authorized to settle the action entitled Southern California Federal Savings & Loan Association, (formerly Southern California Savings and Loan Association), Superior Court No. 815-223, for refund of business taxes by the payment of $172,975.57 (consisting of $134,842.96 in tax refunds and $38,132.61 in interest) to be paid in four equal annual installments with no interest on the deferred payments.

APPROVED AS TO FORM AND RECOMMENDED:

LOUISE H. RENNE
City Attorney

PATRICK J. MAHONEY
Chief Trial Deputy

RECOMMENDED:

TAX COLLECTOR

THAD BROWN
Tax Collector

FUNDS AVAILABLE:

EDWARD M. HARRINGTON
Controller
1498j-12

01 001 97 09 08
310441 1450 $172,975.57
MAY 04 1993

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

CC

Board of Supervisors, San Francisco

Passed for Second Reading

May 24, 1993

Ayes: Supervisors Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Kennedy Migden Shelley

Absent: Supervisors Achtenberg Maher

Finally Passed

June 1, 1993

Ayes: Supervisors Achtenberg Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Migden Shelley

Absent: Supervisors Kennedy Maher

I hereby certify that the foregoing ordinance was finally passed by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco

Clerk

File No. 45-93-29

JUN 11 1993

Date Approved

Mayor

DOCUMENTS DEPT.
JUL 01 1993
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

FILE NO. 45-93-30 ORDINANCE NO. 176-93

RO #92234

(SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION)

AUTHORIZING SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION OF GLENDALE FEDERAL BANK, A FEDERAL SAVINGS BANK (FORMERLY GLENDALE FEDERAL SAVINGS AND LOAN ASSOCIATION) IN THE SUM OF $644,655.72 (CONSISTING OF $494,554.24 IN TAX REFUNDS AND $150,101.48 IN INTEREST) TO BE PAID IN FOUR EQUAL ANNUAL INSTALLMENTS.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. The City Attorney is hereby authorized to settle the action entitled Glendale Federal Bank v. City and County of San Francisco, Superior Court No. 948-297, for refund of business taxes by the payment of $644,655.72 (consisting of $494,554.24 in tax refunds and $150,101.48 in interest) to be paid in four equal annual installments with no interest on the deferred payments.

APPROVED AS TO FORM AND RECOMMENDED:

LOUISE H. RENNE
City Attorney

PATRICK J. MAHONEY
Chief Trial Deputy

RECOMMENDED:

TAX COLLECTOR

FOR THAD BROWN
Tax Collector

FUNDS AVAILABLE:

01 001 97 09 08
310441 1450 $644,655.72

EDWARD M. HARRINGTON
Controller

MAY 04 1993

14381/8
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Board of Supervisors, San Francisco

Passed for Second Reading	Finally Passed
May 24, 1993	June 1, 1993
Ayes: Supervisors Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Kennedy Migden Shelley	Ayes: Supervisors Achtenberg Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Migden Shelley
Absent: Supervisors Achtenberg Maher	Absent: Supervisors Kennedy Maher

I hereby certify that the foregoing ordinance was finally passed by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco

Clerk

File No.
45-93-30

JUN 11 1993

Date Approved

Mayor

DOCUMENTS DEPT.
JUL 01 1993
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

FILE NO. 45-93-31 ORDINANCE NO. 177-93

RO #92231

(SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION)

APPROVING THE SETTLEMENT OF THE LITIGATION OF UNITED SAVINGS BANK, A FEDERAL SAVINGS BANK, IN THE SUM OF IN THE SUM OF $825,313.89 (CONSISTING OF $650,658.19 IN TAX REFUNDS PLUS $174,655.70 IN INTEREST) TO BE PAID IN FOUR EQUAL ANNUAL INSTALLMENTS.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. The City Attorney is hereby authorized to settle the action entitled United Savings Bank v. City and County of San Francisco, Superior Court No. 948-299, for refund of business taxes by the payment of $825,313.89 (consisting of $650,658.19 in tax refunds plus $174,655.70 in interest) to be paid in four equal annual installments with no interest on the deferred payments.

APPROVED AS TO FORM AND RECOMMENDED:

LOUISE H. RENNE
City Attorney

PATRICK J. MAHONEY
Chief Trial Deputy

RECOMMENDED:

TAX COLLECTOR

FOR THAD BROWN
Tax Collector

FUNDS AVAILABLE:

EDWARD M. HARRINGTON
Controller

01 001 97 09 08
310441 1450 $825,313.89

MAY 04 1993

1498j/4

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

CC

Board of Supervisors, San Francisco

Passed for Second Reading	Finally Passed
May 24, 1993	June 1, 1993
Ayes: Supervisors Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Kennedy Migden Shelley	Ayes: Supervisors Achtenberg Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Migden Shelley
Absent: Supervisors Achtenberg Maher	Absent: Supervisors Kennedy Maher

I hereby certify that the foregoing ordinance was finally passed by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco

Clerk

File No. 45-93-31

JUN 11 1993

Date Approved

Mayor

DOCUMENTS DEPT.
JUL 01 1993
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

FILE NO. 45-93-32 ORDINANCE NO. 178-93

RO #92238

(SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION)

AUTHORIZING SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION OF UNITED SAVINGS BANK, A FEDERAL SAVINGS BANK, AS SUCCESSOR IN INTEREST TO GOLDEN COIN SAVINGS AND LOAN ASSOCIATION IN THE SUM OF $326,399.05 (CONSISTING OF $253,623.85 IN TAX REFUNDS AND $72,775.20 IN INTEREST) TO BE PAID IN FOUR EQUAL ANNUAL INSTALLMENTS PLUS STATUTORY INTEREST.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. The City Attorney is hereby authorized to settle the action entitled United Savings Bank, a Federal Savings Bank, as Successor in Interest to Golden Coin Savings and Loan Association, Superior Court No. 948-300, for refund of business taxes by the payment of $326,399.05 (consisting of $253,623.85 in tax refunds and $72,775.20 in interest) to be paid in four equal annual installments with no interest on the deferred payments.

APPROVED AS TO FORM AND RECOMMENDED:

LOUISE H. RENNE
City Attorney

PATRICK J. MAHONEY
Chief Trial Deputy

RECOMMENDED:

TAX COLLECTOR

FOR THAD BROWN
Tax Collector

FUNDS AVAILABLE:

EDWARD M. HARRINGTON
Controller
1498j/5

01 001 97 09 08
310441 1450 $326,399.05

MAY 04 1993

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

CC

Board of Supervisors, San Francisco

Passed for Second Reading	Finally Passed
May 24, 1993	June 1, 1993
Ayes: Supervisors Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Kennedy Migden Shelley	Ayes: Supervisors Achtenberg Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Migden Shelley
Absent: Supervisors Achtenberg Maher	Absent: Supervisors Kennedy Maher

I hereby certify that the foregoing ordinance was finally passed by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco

JUN 11 1993

Clerk

File No.
45-93-32

Date Approved

Mayor

DOCUMENTS DEPT.
JUL 01 1993
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

FILE NO. 45-93-33 ORDINANCE NO. 179-93

RO #92232

(SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION)

AUTHORIZING SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION OF COAST FEDERAL BANK IN THE SUM OF $961,485.57 (CONSISTING OF $703,038.20 IN TAX REFUNDS AND $258,447.37 IN INTEREST) TO BE PAID IN TEN EQUAL ANNUAL INSTALLMENTS AT 7% PER ANNUM INTEREST OVER THE TEN-YEAR PERIOD.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. The City Attorney is hereby authorized to settle the action entitled Coast Federal Bank v. City and County of San Francisco, Superior Court No. 948-298, for refund of business taxes by the payment of $961,485.57 (consisting of $703,038.20 in tax refunds and $258,447.37 in interest) to be paid in ten equal annual installments at 7% per annum interest over the ten-year period.

APPROVED AS TO FORM AND RECOMMENDED:

LOUISE H. RENNE
City Attorney

PATRICK J. MAHONEY
Chief Trial Deputy

RECOMMENDED:

TAX COLLECTOR

FOR THAD BROWN
Tax Collector

FUNDS AVAILABLE:

01 001 97 09 08
310441 1450 $961,485.57

EDWARD M. HARRINGTON
Controller

MAY 04 1993

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
1498J-10

CC

Board of Supervisors, San Francisco

Passed for Second Reading	Finally Passed
May 24, 1993	June 1, 1993
Ayes: Supervisors Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Kennedy Migden Shelley	Ayes: Supervisors Achtenberg Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Migden Shelley
Absent: Supervisors Achtenberg Maher	Absent: Supervisors Kennedy Maher

I hereby certify that the foregoing ordinance was finally passed by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco

Clerk

File No.
45-93-33

JUN 11 1993

Date Approved

Mayor

DOCUMENTS DEPT.
JUL 01 1993
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

FILE NO. 45-93-34 ORDINANCE NO. 180-93

RO #92237

(SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION)

AUTHORIZING SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION OF CALIFORNIA FEDERAL BANK IN THE SUM OF $1,119,749.10 (CONSISTING OF $831,410.84 IN TAX REFUNDS AND $288,338.26 IN INTEREST) TO BE PAID IN TEN EQUAL ANNUAL INSTALLMENTS AT 7% PER ANNUM OVER THE TEN-YEAR PERIOD.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. The City Attorney is hereby authorized to settle the action entitled California Federal Bank v. City and County of San Francisco, Superior Court No. 948-295, for refund of business taxes by the payment of $1,119,749.10 (consisting of $831,410.84 in tax refunds and $288,338.26 in interest) to be paid in ten equal annual installments at 7% per annum over the ten-year period.

APPROVED AS TO FORM AND RECOMMENDED:

LOUISE H. RENNE
City Attorney

PATRICK J. MAHONEY
Chief Trial Deputy

RECOMMENDED:

TAX COLLECTOR

FOR THAD BROWN
Tax Collector

FUNDS AVAILABLE:

01 001 97 09 08
310441 1450 $1,119,749.10

EDWARD M. HARRINGTON
Controller

MAY 04 1993

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
1498j-15

CC

Board of Supervisors, San Francisco

Passed for Second Reading	Finally Passed
May 24, 1993	June 1, 1993
Ayes: Supervisors Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Kennedy Migden Shelley	Ayes: Supervisors Achtenberg Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Migden Shelley
Absent: Supervisors Achtenberg Maher	Absent: Supervisors Kennedy Maher

I hereby certify that the foregoing ordinance was finally passed by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco

John L. Taylor
Clerk

JUN 11 1993

File No.
45-93-34

Date Approved

Mayor

DOCUMENTS DEPT.
JUL 01 1993
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

FILE NO. 45-93-35 ORDINANCE NO. 181-93

RO #92236

(SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION)

APPROVING THE SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION OF SAN FRANCISCO FEDERAL SAVINGS & LOAN ASSOCIATION IN THE SUM OF $1,202,718.79 (INCLUDING $948,933.00 IN TAX REFUNDS AND $253,785.79 IN INTEREST) TO BE PAID IN TEN EQUAL ANNUAL INSTALLMENTS AT 7% PER ANNUM INTEREST OVER THE TEN-YEAR PERIOD.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section. The City Attorney is hereby authorized to settle the action entitled San Francisco Federal Savings and Loan Association, Superior Court No. 940-841, for refund of business taxes by the payment of $1,202,718.79 (including $948,933.00 in tax refunds and $253,785.79 in interest) to be paid in ten equal annual installments at 7% per annum interest over the ten-year period.

APPROVED AS TO FORM AND RECOMMENDED:

LOUISE H. RENNE
City Attorney

PATRICK J. MAHONEY
Chief Trial Deputy

RECOMMENDED:

TAX COLLECTOR

for THAD BROWN
Tax Collector

FUNDS AVAILABLE:

EDWARD M. HARRINGTON
Controller

01 001 97 09 08
310441 1450 $1,202,718.79
MAY 04 1993

CC

Board of Supervisors, San Francisco

Passed for Second Reading	Finally Passed
May 24, 1993	June 1, 1993
Ayes: Supervisors Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Kennedy Migden Shelley	Ayes: Supervisors Achtenberg Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Migden Shelley
Absent: Supervisors Achtenberg Maher	Absent: Supervisors Kennedy Maher

I hereby certify that the foregoing ordinance was finally passed by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco

Clerk

File No. 45-93-35

JUN 11 1993
Date Approved

Mayor

DOCUMENTS DEPT.
JUL 01 1993
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

FILE NO. 45-93-36

ORDINANCE NO. 182-93

RO #92235

(SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION)

APPROVING THE SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION OF HOME SAVINGS OF AMERICA, F.A. IN THE SUM OF $1,738,814.82 (CONSISTING OF $1,228,201.03 IN TAX REFUNDS AND $510,613.79 IN INTEREST) TO BE PAID IN TEN EQUAL ANNUAL INSTALLMENTS AT 7% PER ANNUM INTEREST OVER THE TEN-YEAR PERIOD.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. The City Attorney is hereby authorized to settle the action entitled Home Savings of American, F.A. Superior Court No. 840-952, for refund of business taxes by the payment of $1,738,814.82 (consisting of $1,228,201.03 in tax refunds and $510,613.79 in interest) to be paid in ten equal annual installments at 7% per annum interest and over the ten-year period.

APPROVED AS TO FORM AND RECOMMENDED:

LOUISE H. RENNE
City Attorney

PATRICK J. MAHONEY
Chief Trial Deputy

RECOMMENDED:

TAX COLLECTOR

FOR THAD BROWN
Tax Collector

FUNDS AVAILABLE:

01 001 97 09 08
310441 1450 $1,738,814.82

EDWARD M. HARRINGTON
Controller

MAY 04 1993

1498j-7

Board of Supervisors, San Francisco

Passed for Second Reading	Finally Passed
May 24, 1993	June 1, 1993
Ayes: Supervisors Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Kennedy Migden Shelley	Ayes: Supervisors Achtenberg Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Migden Shelley
Absent: Supervisors Achtenberg Maher	Absent: Supervisors Kennedy Maher

I hereby certify that the foregoing ordinance was finally passed by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco

Clerk

File No.
45-93-36

JUN 11 1993

Date Approved

Mayor

DOCUMENTS DEPT.
JUL 01 1993
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

CC

FILE NO. 45-93-37 ORDINANCE NO. 83-93

RO #92233

(SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION)

APPROVING THE SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION OF 1ST NATIONWIDE BANK, A FEDERAL SAVINGS BANK (FORMERLY 1ST NATIONWIDE SAVINGS) IN THE SUM OF $3,149,870.70 (CONSISTING OF $2,565,609.75 IN TAX REFUNDS AND $584,260.95 IN INTEREST) TO BE PAID IN TEN EQUAL ANNUAL INSTALLMENTS AT 7% PER ANNUM IN INTEREST OVER THE TEN-YEAR PERIOD.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. The City Attorney is hereby authorized to settle the action entitled First Nationwide Bank, a Federal Savings Bank (formerly First Nationwide Savings), Superior Court No. 948-294, for refund of business taxes by the payment of $3,149,870.70 (consisting of $2,565,609.75 in tax refunds and $584,260.95 in interest) to be paid in ten equal annual installments at 7% per annum in interest over the ten-year period.

APPROVED AS TO FORM AND RECOMMENDED:

LOUISE H. RENNE
City Attorney

PATRICK J. MAHONEY
Chief Trial Deputy

RECOMMENDED:

TAX COLLECTOR

For THAD BROWN
Tax Collector

FUNDS AVAILABLE:

01 001 97 09 08
310441 1450 $3,149,870.70

EDWARD M. HARRINGTON
Controller

MAY 04 1993

Board of Supervisors, San Francisco

Passed for Second Reading	Finally Passed
May 24, 1993	June 1, 1993
Ayes: Supervisors Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Kennedy Migden Shelley	Ayes: Supervisors Achtenberg Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Migden Shelley
Absent: Supervisors Achtenberg Maher	Absent: Supervisors Kennedy Maher

I hereby certify that the foregoing ordinance was finally passed by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco

John Taylor
Clerk

File No.
45-93-37

JUN 11 1993
Date Approved

Mayor

DOCUMENTS DEPT.
JUL 01 1993
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

FILE NO. 47-93-3 ORDINANCE NO. 84-93

(Commercial Lease Documents)

APPROVING AND ADOPTING POLK-BUSH GARAGE COMMERCIAL LEASE LEGAL DOCUMENTS AND AUTHORIZATION FOR LEASE AGREEMENT.

Be It Ordained by the people of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. In accordance with the recommendation of the Parking Authority of the City and County of San Francisco, there has been filed with the Clerk of the Board certain documents which consist of:

1. Form for Invitation to Bid
2. Form of Bid
3. Form of Questionnaire
4. Form of Lease Agreement

Section 2. The legal documents are hereby approved in substantially the form now filed in the office of the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors and are made a part hereof by reference.

Section 3. The Director of Property is authorized to request Bids for said lease agreement pursuant to and in accordance with the form for Invitation to Bid.

RECOMMENDED:

By _____
Executive Director
Parking and Traffic

By _____
Director of Property

C:\WP51\DATA\ORD193-1.BG

APPROVED AS TO FORM:
Louise H. Renne, City Attorney

By _____
Deputy City Attorney

(Real Estate)

CC

Board of Supervisors, San Francisco

Passed for Second Reading	Finally Passed
May 24, 1993	June 1, 1993
Ayes: Supervisors Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Kennedy Migden Shelley	Ayes: Supervisors Achtenberg Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Migden Shelley
Absent: Supervisors Achtenberg Maher	Absent: Supervisors Kennedy Maher

I hereby certify that the foregoing ordinance was finally passed by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco

_____
Clerk

File No.
47-93-3

JUN 11 1993
Date Approved

_____
Mayor

DOCUMENTS DEPT.
JUL 01 1993
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

As amended in committee
5/19/93

FILE NO. 97-93-24

ORDINANCE NO. 185-93

RO #92245

CC

(Revolving Fund)

AMENDING THE SAN FRANCISCO ADMINISTRATIVE CODE BY AMENDING CHAPTER 10, ARTICLE XV, SECTION 10.169 THEREOF TO REDUCE SAN FRANCISCO PORT COMMISSION REVOLVING FUND TO $60,000.00

NOTE: ADDITIONS OR SUBSTITUTIONS ARE UNDERLINED.
DELETIONS ARE ((DOUBLE PARENTHESES)).

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. The San Francisco Administrative Code, Chapter 10, Article XV, Section 10.169 is hereby amended thereof to read as follows:

Section 10.169 - Cash Revolving Funds - San Francisco Port Commission ((~~$777,000.00~~)) $560,000.00 $60,000.00.

kg
5/19

APPROVED AS TO FORM:
LOUISE H. RENNE
City Attorney

By: Deputy City Attorney

RECOMMENDED:

SAN FRANCISCO PORT COMMISSION

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Board of Supervisors, San Francisco

Passed for Second Reading	Finally Passed
May 24, 1993	June 1, 1993
Ayes: Supervisors Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Kennedy Migden Shelley	Ayes: Supervisors Achtenberg Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Migden Shelley
Absent: Supervisors Achtenberg Maher	Absent: Supervisors Kennedy Maher

I hereby certify that the foregoing ordinance was finally passed by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco

Clerk

File No.
97-93-24

JUN 11 1993
Date Approved

Mayor

DOCUMENTS DEPT.
JUL 01 1993
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

[License Fee]

AMENDING THE SAN FRANCISCO ADMINISTRATIVE CODE BY AMENDING SECTION 37A.2(d) THEREOF TO INCREASE THE RESIDENTIAL RENT STABILIZATION AND ARBITRATION FEE.

Note: Additions or substitutions are underlined; deletions are in ((double parentheses)).

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

SEC. 37A.2. FINDINGS. The Board of Supervisors hereby finds:

(a) In Section 37.1 of this Code, the Board of Supervisors found that there was a shortage of decent, safe and sanitary housing in the City and County of San Francisco resulting in a critically low vacancy factor. The Board further found that rent regulation was necessary in order to alleviate the ill effects of the City's housing shortage to meet the need for affordable housing, and to advance the City's housing policies. The Board now hereby finds that this housing shortage still persists and that rent regulation continues to be a necessary and effective means of mitigating this condition.

(b) By Ordinance No. 276-79, adopted June 12, 1979, the Board of Supervisors enacted the Residential Rent and Arbitration Ordinance ("Rent Ordinance," Chapter 37, San Francisco Administrative Code) to regulate residential rents in San Francisco. The Ordinance created the Residential Rent

Stabilization and Arbitration Board ("Rent Board," Sections 37.1(a), (b) and 37.4) to administer and enforce the Rent Ordinance and thereby safeguard tenants from excessive increases while at the same time assure landlords fair and adequate rents. The Rent Board benefits both landlords and tenants by providing for the orderly and efficient administration of the Rent Ordinance and by protecting tenants from unreasonable rent increases and displacement while assuring that landlords receive fair rents consistent with the Ordinance.

(c) It is fair and reasonable that the costs of administering and enforcing the Rent Ordinance through the Rent Board should be equitably distributed among the City's residential units.

Therefore, the Board finds that the owner of each residential unit as defined in Section 37A.1 above shall be required to pay an annual Rent Stabilization and Arbitration fee for each unit.

(d) The fee for each residential unit shall equal the projected annual cost of funding the Rent Board plus related administrative costs pursuant to Section 10.194 of this Code including, but not limited to, the Tax Collector and Controller divided by the total number of residential units estimated to pay the fee minus any balance remaining in the fund set forth in Section 10.117-88 of this Code; provided, however, that in calculating the fee, the Controller shall round up any fraction

DOCUMENTS DEPT.
JUL 01 1993
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

of a dollar to the next whole dollar, provided further, however, that the fee shall in no event exceed ((~~$8.00~~)) $10.00 per residential unit. For the purposes of this calculation, a guest room shall be counted as one-half of a residential unit and shall be charged half the fee. The Assessor and the Superintendent of the Bureau of Building Inspection shall release to the Information Services Division (IDS) of the Controller's Office by June 1st information necessary for compilation of the billing list. The Controller shall compile the list, determine the total number of residential units and calculate the fee by July 31st. The fee shall be recalculated on July 31st each year.

(e) The fee herein is for regulatory purposes only. It is not designed or intended for revenue purposes. Any surplus collected in a given year will reduce the fee in the next fiscal year.

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

LOUISE H. RENNE
City Attorney

By: Deputy City Attorney

BRIEF DATED

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

PAGE NO. 3

cc

Board of Supervisors, San Francisco

Passed for Second Reading	Finally Passed
May 24, 1993	June 1, 1993
Ayes: Supervisors Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Kennedy Migden Shelley	Ayes: Supervisors Achtenberg Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Migden Shelley
Absent: Supervisors Achtenberg Maher	Absent: Supervisors Kennedy Maher

I hereby certify that the foregoing ordinance was finally passed by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco

John Taylor
Clerk

File No.
97-93-26

JUN 11 1993
Date Approved

Frank G. Jordan
Mayor

FILE NO. 101-92-68 ORDINANCE NO. 187-93

(Government Funding) RO# 92219 SA# 108

APPROPRIATING $117,947,912 FOR VARIOUS CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS AND BOND REDEMPTION AND RESCINDING $5,581,450 FROM THE BOND RESERVE PAYMENT, AIRPORT COMMISSION FOR FISCAL YEAR 1992 - 93.

Be it ordained by the people of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. FUNDS ARE HEREBY APPROPRIATED FOR FY 1992-93 AS FOLLOWS:

Department and Number	Source of Funds and Purpose of Appropriation	Amount Debit	Amount Credit
30 - 891	**Refunding Bonds Series - Issue 2**		
27 - 00 - 00	**Airport**		
Project 001 - 01	Proceeds - Refunding Bonds		
55-5500 (057497)	Proceeds - Sale of Bonds	$106,785,012	
Project 010 - 01	Deposit - Refunding Escrow		
20-2030 (574053)	Capital Improvement Project		$97,446,084
Project 050 - 01	Bond Reserve Payment		
20-2030 (574053)	Capital Improvement Project		8,688,928
Project 075 - 01	Professional and Special Services		
20-2030 (574053)	Capital Improvement Project		650,000
	Total - Airport Operating Fund	$106,785,012	$106,785,012
30 - 873	**1983 Series "D" Bond Fund**		
Project 001 - 01	Unallocated		
90-9090 (045450)	Miscellaneous Revenues	$5,581,450	
Project 010 - 01	Utilities Improvement		
40-4000 (574202)	Bond Redemption		$5,581,450
	Total - 1983 Series "D" Bond Fund	$5,581,450	$5,581,450
30 - 001	**Airport Operating Fund**		
27 - 00 - 00	**Airport**		
40-4020 (570416)	Bond Reserve Payment	$5,581,450	
49-4900 (916291)	Revenue Transfer Out to # 30 - 520, Airport Contingency Fund		$5,581,450
	Total - Airport Operating Fund	$5,581,450	$5,581,450
30 - 520	**Airport Contingency Fund**		
Project 001 - 99	Revenue Transfer In # 30 - 001		
99-9990 (232272)	Revenue Transfer In From # 30 - 001, Airport Operating Fund	$5,581,450	
Project 001 - 01	Airport Contingency		
20-2030 (574012)	Capital Improvement Project		$5,581,450
	Total - Airport Contingency Fund	$5,581,450	$5,581,450
	Grand Total	$117,947,912	$117,947,912

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

DOCUMENTS DEPT.
JUL 01 1993
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

RO# 92219 SA# 108

APPROVED AS TO FORM:
LOUISE H. RENNE, CITY ATTORNEY

BY: _____
DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY

FUNDS AVAILABLE:

_____
CONTROLLER

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

CC

Board of Supervisors, San Francisco

Passed for Second Reading	Finally Passed
May 24, 1993	June 1, 1993
Ayes: Supervisors Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Kennedy Migden Shelley	Ayes: Supervisors Achtenberg Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Migden Shelley
Absent: Supervisors Achtenberg Maher	Absent: Supervisors Kennedy Maher

I hereby certify that the foregoing ordinance was finally passed by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco

John L. Taylor
Clerk

File No.
101-92-68

JUN 11 1993
Date Approved

Frank M. Jordan
Mayor

As amended in committee
5/19/93

FILE NO. 101-92-74

ORDINANCE NO. 188-93

(Government Funding)

RO# 92226 SA# 82

APPROPRIATING $64,770,000 FOR VARIOUS CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS, DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1992 - 93.; placing $38,117,000 on reserve.

kg 5/19/93

Be it ordained by the people of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. FUNDS ARE HEREBY APPROPRIATED FOR FY 1992-93 AS FOLLOWS:

Department and Number	Source of Funds and Purpose of Appropriation	Amount Debit	Amount Credit
05 - 615	**1990 Earthquake Safety Bond Fund**		
90 - 02 - 00	**Public Works**		
55-5500 (054569)	Proceeds - Sale of Bonds	$64,770,000	
Project 002 - 01	Planning/Project Control		
20-2030 (772194)	Capital Improvement Project		$3,875,000
Project 100 - 01	Various Buildings Improvements		
20-2030 (772194)	Capital Improvement Project		2,740,000
Project 500 - 01	City Hall and Public Health Headquarters		
20-2030 (772194)	Capital Improvement Project		38,257,000
Project 600 - 01	Performing Arts Building		
20-2030 (772194)	Capital Improvement Project		19,898,000
	Total	$64,770,000	$64,770,000

kg 5/19/93

Sec. 2. Funds in the amount of $38,117,000 are hereby placed on reserve pending the selection of contractors and determination of their MBE/WBE status, to be released by the Budget Committee.

APPROVED AS TO FORM:
LOUISE H. RENNE, CITY ATTORNEY

BY: _____
DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY

FUNDS AVAILABLE:

_____
CONTROLLER

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Board of Supervisors, San Francisco

Passed for Second Reading

May 24, 1993

Ayes: Supervisors Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Kennedy Migden Shelley

Absent: Supervisors Achtenberg Maher

Finally Passed

June 1, 1993

Ayes: Supervisors Achtenberg Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Migden Shelley

Absent: Supervisors Kennedy Maher

I hereby certify that the foregoing ordinance was finally passed by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco

JUN 11 1993

_____
Clerk

File No.
101-92-74

_____
Date Approved

_____
Mayor

DOCUMENTS DEPT.
JUL 01 1993
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

FILE NO. 101-92-75

Budget

ORDINANCE NO. 89-93

(Government Funding)

RO# 92247 SA# 109

APPROPRIATING $19,745 FOR SERVICES OF OTHER DEPARTMENTS - AUTOMOTIVE MAINTENANCE - CENTRAL SHOPS, SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1992-93

Be it ordained by the people of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. FUNDS ARE HEREBY APPROPRIATED FOR FY 1992-93 AS FOLLOWS:

Department and Number	Source of Funds and Purpose of Appropriation	Amount Debit	Amount Credit
02 - 503	**State Authorized Special Revenue Fund**		
06 - 00 - 00	**Sheriff**		
Project 010 - 00	AB 1109 Vehicle Maintenance		
70-7025 (050393)	Sheriff's Fees	$19,745	
30-3100 (305086)	Automotive Maintenance - Central Shops		$19,745

APPROVED AS TO FORM:
LOUISE H. RENNE, CITY ATTORNEY

BY: _____
DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY

FUNDS AVAILABLE:

_____
CONTROLLER

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

CC

Board of Supervisors, San Francisco

Passed for Second Reading

May 24, 1993

Ayes: Supervisors Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Kennedy Migden Shelley

Absent: Supervisors Achtenberg Maher

Finally Passed

June 1, 1993

Ayes: Supervisors Achtenberg Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Migden Shelley

Absent: Supervisors Kennedy Maher

I hereby certify that the foregoing ordinance was finally passed by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco

_____
Clerk

File No. 101-92-75

JUN 11 1993
Date Approved

_____
Mayor

DOCUMENTS DEPT.
JUL 01 1993
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

FILE NO. 101-92-76

Budget
ORDINANCE NO. 190-93

(Government Funding)

RO# 92248 SA# 112 & 115

APPROPRIATING $173,000 FOR VARIOUS PROGRAM PROJECT BUDGET (CITY ATTORNEY AND CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER), FOR FISCAL YEAR 1992 - 93.

Be it ordained by the people of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. FUNDS ARE HEREBY APPROPRIATED FOR FY 1992-93 AS FOLLOWS:

Department and Number	Source of Funds and Purpose of Appropriation	Amount Debit	Amount Credit
05 - 613	**1989 Earthquake Safety Bond Fund**		
90 - 02 - 00	**Public Works**		
55-5500 (053595)	Proceeds - Sale of Bonds	$173,000	
03 -00 - 00	**City Attorney**		
Project 001 - 01	Legal Services		
20-2010 (302190)	Program Project Budget		$100,440
70 - 04 - 01	**Chief Administrative Officer**		
Project 007 - 00	Financial Consultation		
20-2010 (420588)	Program Project Budget		72,560
	Total	**$173,000**	**$173,000**

APPROVED AS TO FORM:
LOUISE H. RENNE, CITY ATTORNEY

BY: [signature]
DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY

FUNDS AVAILABLE:

[signature]
CONTROLLER

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

CC

Board of Supervisors, San Francisco

Passed for Second Reading

May 24, 1993

Ayes: Supervisors Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Kennedy Migden Shelley

Absent: Supervisors Achtenberg Maher

Finally Passed

June 1, 1993

Ayes: Supervisors Achtenberg Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Migden Shelley

Absent: Supervisors Kennedy Maher

I hereby certify that the foregoing ordinance was finally passed by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco

[signature]
Clerk

JUN 11 1993
Date Approved

[signature]
Mayor

File No.
101-92-76

DOCUMENTS DEPT.
JUL 01 1993
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

FILE NO. 101-92-77

(Government Funding)

Budget
ORDINANCE NO. 191-93

RO# 92250 SA# 114

APPROPRIATING $77,000 FOR VARIOUS PROGRAM PROJECT BUDGET (CITY ATTORNEY AND CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER), FOR FISCAL YEAR 1992 - 93.

Be it ordained by the people of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. FUNDS ARE HEREBY APPROPRIATED FOR FY 1992-93 AS FOLLOWS:

Department and Number	Source of Funds and Purpose of Appropriation	Amount Debit	Amount Credit
05 - 622	**Golden Gate Park Bond Fund**		
42 - 04 - 00	**Recreation and Park**		
Project 901 - 00	Golden Gate Park Improvement		
55-5500 (057786)	Proceeds - Sale of Bonds	$77,000	
03 -00 - 00	**City Attorney**		
Project	Legal Services		
20-2010 (302307)	Program Project Budget		$57,930
70 - 04 - 01	**Chief Administrative Officer**		
Project 015 - 01	Financial Consultation		
20-2010 (420034)	Program Project Budget		19,070
	Total	$77,000	$77,000

APPROVED AS TO FORM:
LOUISE H. RENNE, CITY ATTORNEY

BY: [signature]
DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY

FUNDS AVAILABLE:

[signature]
CONTROLLER

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

CC

Board of Supervisors, San Francisco

Passed for Second Reading

May 24, 1993

Ayes: Supervisors Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Kennedy Migden Shelley

Absent: Supervisors Achtenberg Maher

Finally Passed

June 1, 1993

Ayes: Supervisors Achtenberg Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Migden Shelley

Absent: Supervisors Kennedy Maher

I hereby certify that the foregoing ordinance was finally passed by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco

[signature]
Clerk

File No.
101-92-77

JUN 1 1 1993
Date Approved

[signature]
Mayor

DOCUMENTS DEPT
JUL 0 1 1993
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

FILE NO. 101-92-78

Budget

ORDINANCE NO. 192-93

(Government Funding)

RO# 92249 SA# 113

CC

APPROPRIATING $230,000 FOR VARIOUS PROGRAM PROJECT BUDGET (CITY ATTORNEY AND CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER), FOR FISCAL YEAR 1992 - 93.

Be it ordained by the people of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. FUNDS ARE HEREBY APPROPRIATED FOR FY 1992-93 AS FOLLOWS:

Department and Number	Source of Funds and Purpose of Appropriation	Amount Debit	Amount Credit
05 - 615	**1990 Earthquake Safety Bond Fund**		
90 - 02 - 00	**Public works**		
55-5500 (054569)	Proceeds - Sale of Bonds	$230,000	
03 -00 - 00	**City Attorney**		
Project 903 - 01	Legal Services		
20-2010 (302208)	Program Project Budget		$81,630
70 - 04 - 01	**Chief Administrative Officer**		
Project 004 - 00	Financial Consultation		
20-2010 (420539)	Program Project Budget		148,370
	Total	**$230,000**	**$230,000**

APPROVED AS TO FORM:
LOUISE H. RENNE, CITY ATTORNEY

BY: [signature]
DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY

FUNDS AVAILABLE:

[signature]
CONTROLLER

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Board of Supervisors, San Francisco

Passed for Second Reading

May 24, 1993

Ayes: Supervisors Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Kennedy Migden Shelley

Absent: Supervisors Achtenberg Maher

Finally Passed

June 1, 1993

Ayes: Supervisors Achtenberg Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Migden Shelley

Absent: Supervisors Kennedy Maher

I hereby certify that the foregoing ordinance was finally passed by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco

[signature]
Clerk

File No.
101-92-78

JUN 11 1993
Date Approved

[signature]
Mayor

DOCUMENTS DEPT.
JUL 01 1993
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

FILE NO. 101-92-80

Budget

ORDINANCE NO. 193-93

(Government Funding)

RO# 92220 SA# 103

RESCINDING $1,000,000 EQUITY TRANSFER TO THE GENERAL FUND AND REAPPROPRIATING TO THE PORT COMMISSION OPERATING FUND, FOR FISCAL YEAR 1992 - 93.

Be it ordained by the people of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. FUNDS ARE HEREBY APPROPRIATED FOR FY 1992-93 AS FOLLOWS:

Department and Number	Source of Funds and Purpose of Appropriation	Amount Debit	Amount Credit
01 - 001	General Fund		
99 - 00 - 00	General Fund Unallocated		
GL 301 (119990)	Unreserved Fund Balance	$1,000,000	
46-4690	Equity Transfer Out to # 34 - 001,SF Harbor Operating Fund		$1,000,000
	Total - General Fund	$1,000,000	$1,000,000
34 - 001	SF Harbor Operating Fund		
39 - 00 - 00	Port Commission		
95-9900	Equity Transfer In From # 01 - 001, General Fund Unallocated	$1,000,000	
GL 301 (026013)	Unreserved Fund Balance		$1,000,000
	Total - SF Harbor Operating Fund	$1,000,000	$1,000,000

APPROVED AS TO FORM:
LOUISE H. RENNE, CITY ATTORNEY

BY: Thomas J. Owen
DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY

FUNDS AVAILABLE:

John W. Madden
CONTROLLER

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Board of Supervisors, San Francisco

Passed for Second Reading

May 24, 1993

Ayes: Supervisors Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Kennedy Migden Shelley

Absent: Supervisors Achtenberg Maher

Finally Passed

June 1, 1993

Ayes: Supervisors Achtenberg Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Migden Shelley

Absent: Supervisors Kennedy Maher

I hereby certify that the foregoing ordinance was finally passed by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco

John Taylor
Clerk

File No.
101-92-80

JUN 11 1993
Date Approved

Frank M. Jordan
Mayor

DOCUMENTS DEPT.
JUL 01 1993
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

5/19/93

FILE NO. 101-92-83 ORDINANCE NO. 194-93

(Government Funding) RO# 92259 SA# 117

kg 5/19/93

APPROPRIATING $1,438,506 FOR CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECT (~~JAIL #3 SERVICES BUILDING~~ NEW SHERIFF'S FACILITY), FOR FISCAL YEAR 1992 - 93.

Be it ordained by the people of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. FUNDS ARE HEREBY APPROPRIATED FOR FY 1992-93 AS FOLLOWS:

Department and Number	Source of Funds and Purpose of Appropriation	Amount Debit	Amount Credit
05 - 617	1990 Correctional Facilities Improvement Bond		
06 - 00 - 00	Sheriff		
54-5401 (014944)	Interest Earned - Pooled Cash	$1,438,506	
Project 200 - 01	~~Jail # 3 Services Building~~ New Sheriff's Facility		
20-2030 (310268)	Capital Improvement Project		$1,438,506

kg 5/19/93

APPROVED AS TO FORM:
LOUISE H. RENNE, CITY ATTORNEY

BY: [signature]
DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY

FUNDS AVAILABLE:

[signature]
CONTROLLER

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Board of Supervisors, San Francisco

Passed for Second Reading	Finally Passed
May 24, 1993	June 1, 1993
Ayes: Supervisors Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Kennedy Migden Shelley	Ayes: Supervisors Achtenberg Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Migden Shelley
Absent: Supervisors Achtenberg Maher	Absent: Supervisors Kennedy Maher

I hereby certify that the foregoing ordinance was finally passed by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco

[signature]
Clerk

File No. 101-92-83

JUN 11 1993
Date Approved

[signature]
Mayor

DOCUMENTS DEPT.
JUL 01 1993
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

File No. 105-93-2 Ordinance No. 195-93

(Benefits For Fire Department Chief and Deputy Chief)

APPROVING THE PROVISION OF HEALTH BENEFITS EQUAL TO THOSE PROVIDED TO FIREFIGHTERS TO CLASSIFICATIONS 0140 CHIEF OF DEPARTMENT AND 0150 DEPUTY CHIEF CONDITIONAL ON THE SIGNING OF WAIVERS REGARDING THE ~~1990-91~~ 1991-92 WAGE FREEZE providing for ratification of action previously taken. mlr 5/19

Note: This entire section is new.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco.

Section 1. The board of supervisors hereby ratifies and approves the provision of health benefits equal to those provided to Firefighters to classifications 0140 Chief of Department and 0150 Deputy Chief of Department. Provision of benefits shall be contingent upon execution of a waiver regarding the 1991-92 wage freeze in the form prepared by the City Attorney, and, be it

mlr 5/19 FURTHER RESOLVED, That although the City has incurred no legal obligation, the Board of Supervisors does hereby ratify the action previously taken.

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

LOUISE H. RENNE
CITY ATTORNEY

Vulia A. Clayton
DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY

87351

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Board of Supervisors, San Francisco

Passed for Second Reading	Finally Passed
May 24, 1993	June 1, 1993
Ayes: Supervisors Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Kennedy Migden Shelley	Ayes: Supervisors Achtenberg Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Migden Shelley
Absent: Supervisors Achtenberg Maher	Absent: Supervisors Kennedy Maher

I hereby certify that the foregoing ordinance was finally passed by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco

John L. Taylor
Clerk

File No. 105-93-2

JUN 11 1993
Date Approved

Frank M. Jordan
Mayor

DOCUMENTS DEPT.
JUL 01 1993
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

As amended in committee
May 19, 1993.

File No. 105-93-3 ORDINANCE NO. 196-93

(Benefits For Police Department Chief)

APPROVING THE PROVISION OF HEALTH BENEFITS EQUAL TO THOSE PROVIDED TO Q2 POLICE OFFICERS TO CLASSIFICATION 0390 POLICE CHIEF CONDITIONAL ON THE SIGNING OF A WAIVER REGARDING THE 1991-92 ~~1990-91~~ WAGE FREEZE providing for ratification of action previously taken.

mlr 5/19

Note: This entire section is new.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco.

Section 1. The board of supervisors hereby ratifies and approves the provision of health benefits equal to those provided to Q2 Police Officers to classification 0390 Police Chief. Provision of benefits shall be contingent upon execution of a waiver regarding the 1991-92 wage freeze in the form prepared by the City Attorney; and, be it

mlr 5/19

FURTHER RESOLVED, That although the City has incurred no legal obligation, the Board of Supervisors does hereby ratify the action previously taken.

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

LOUISE H. RENNE
CITY ATTORNEY

Vicki A. Clayton
DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY

87351

PAGE 1 OF 1
4/27/93

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Board of Supervisors, San Francisco

Passed for Second Reading	Finally Passed
May 24, 1993	June 1, 1993
Ayes: Supervisors Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Kennedy Migden Shelley	Ayes: Supervisors Achtenberg Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Migden Shelley
Absent: Supervisors Achtenberg Maher	Absent: Supervisors Kennedy Maher

I hereby certify that the foregoing ordinance was finally passed by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco

John Taylor
Clerk

File No. 105-93-3

JUN 11 1993
Date Approved

Frank M. Jordan
Mayor

DOCUMENTS DEPT.
JUL 01 1993
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

FILE NO. 124-93-3 ORDINANCE NO. 197-93

(Parking and Traffic)

AMENDING PART II, CHAPTER XI, OF THE SAN FRANCISCO MUNICIPAL CODE (TRAFFIC CODE) BY AMENDING SECTION 203 THEREOF, RELATING TO THE DENOMINATION OF COINS AND LENGTH OF PARKING TIME ALLOWED AT PARKING METERS.

Note: Additions or substitutions are underlined; deletions are in ((double parentheses)).

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. Part II, Chapter XI, of the San Francisco Municipal Code (Traffic Code) is hereby amended by amending Section 203 thereof to read as follows:

SEC. 203 BOARD OF SUPERVISORS TO DETERMINE DENOMINATION OF COINS((,)) AND LENGTH OF PARKING TIME ALLOWED PER COIN; AND THE DIRECTOR OF PARKING AND TRAFFIC TO DETERMINE TOTAL LENGTH OF PARKING TIME ALLOWED AT METER. (A) The denomination of the coin or coins that shall be deposited in the parking meters((,)) and the parking time allowed ((following)) per each deposit of a coin ((such coins, and the hours during which such deposits are required,)) shall be fixed from time to time by Ordinance of the Board of Supervisors for the area or areas in which parking meters are now or may hereafter be installed and shall be such as will best promote efficiency and safety in the use of the public street; provided that no deposit shall be required for any period of time on Sundays in any area in which parking meters are now or may hereafter be installed, except in that portion of the City and County of San Francisco bounded as follows: Commencing at a point where the westerly line of Hyde Street intersects the San Francisco Bay, thence southerly along the westerly line of Hyde Street to the southerly line of Jefferson Street, thence

Supervisor Shelley Kaufman

easterly along the southerly line of Jefferson Street to the westerly line of The Embarcadero, thence southerly along the westerly line of The Embarcadero to the southerly line of Bay Street, thence westerly along the southerly line of Bay Street to the westerly line of Van Ness Avenue, thence northerly along the westerly line of Van Ness Avenue to the San Francisco Bay, thence easterly along the edge of the San Francisco Bay to the point of commencement, and in the area governed by the provisions of Section 220 of the San Francisco Traffic Code.

(B) The Director of Parking and Traffic is hereby authorized to establish the maximum amount of parking time allowed following the deposit of coins in a meter adjacent to a metered parking space (provided that such maximum parking time shall be established within a range of from fifteen minutes to two hours), and the hours during which the deposit of coins in the meters adjacent to such metered parking spaces is required.

(C) The Director shall transmit each decision to establish such time periods to the board of supervisors within two working days. The Director shall also provide public notice of each decision and of appeal procedures. Each decision shall then be held in abeyance for 30 days from the date the Director publishes notice of the decision. Such public notice shall be published in a daily San Francisco newspaper within ten days of each decision and distributed to a mailing list of interested individuals that the Director shall maintain. During the 30 day period when a decision of the Director is held in abeyance, appeals to the decision may be filed with the Director. The Director shall notify the board of supervisors within two working days of any applications filed with the Director by individuals requesting an appeal of

DOCUMENTS DEPT.
JUL 01 1993
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

the decision, and request the board of supervisors to conduct a public hearing to consider the matter. The board of supervisors shall consider the approval within 30 days of receipt of notification from the Director that an appeal was filed, and after hearing public comment, shall uphold, modify, or disapprove the decision. If no application to appeal a decision is filed with the Director within 30 days of the published notice, the decision shall become effective on the 31st day.

The provisions of this Section shall be enforceable on holidays and whenever the term "holiday" or "holidays" appears in any Resolution heretofore or hereafter adopted pursuant to the provisions of this Article, it shall refer specifically and only to Sundays.

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

LOUISE H. RENNE
City Attorney

By: Theodore R. Lakey
for LAWRENCE A. WAYTE
Deputy City Attorney

RECOMMENDED:

John E. Newlin
JOHN E. NEWLIN
Director,
Department of Parking
and Traffic

5307g

Board of Supervisors, San Francisco

Passed for Second Reading	Finally Passed
May 24, 1993	June 1, 1993
Ayes: Supervisors Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Kennedy Migden Shelley	Ayes: Supervisors Achtenberg Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Migden Shelley
Absent: Supervisors Achtenberg Maher	Absent: Supervisors Kennedy Maher

I hereby certify that the foregoing ordinance was finally passed by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco

John Taylor
Clerk

File No.
124-93-3

JUN 11 1993
Date Approved

Frank M. Jordan
Mayor

FILE NO. 101-92-81

Budget
ORDINANCE NO. 198-93

(Government Funding)

RO# 92223 SA# 98

APPROPRIATING $1,604,362 FOR CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECT, POLICE DEPARTMENT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1992 - 93.

Be it ordained by the people of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. FUNDS ARE HEREBY APPROPRIATED FOR FY 1992-93 AS FOLLOWS:

Department and Number	Source of Funds and Purpose of Appropriation	Amount Debit	Amount Credit
05 - 608	**1987 POLICE FACILITIES IMPROVEMENT**		
38 - 03 - 31	Police Department		
54-5401 (056440)	Interest Earned - Pooled Cash	$1,604,362	
Project 902 - 00	Police Facility Improvement		
20-2030 (580357)	Capital Improvement Project		$1,604,362

APPROVED AS TO FORM:
LOUISE H. RENNE, CITY ATTORNEY

BY: _____
DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY

FUNDS AVAILABLE:

_____
CONTROLLER

Board of Supervisors, San Francisco

Passed for Second Reading

June 1, 1993

Ayes: Supervisors Alioto Bierman Conroy Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Achtenberg Migden Shelley

Absent: Supervisors Kennedy Maher

Finally Passed

June 7, 1993

Ayes: Supervisors Alioto Conroy Hallinan Hsieh Kaufman Kennedy Leal Maher Migden Shelley

Absent: Supervisor Bierman

I hereby certify that the foregoing ordinance was finally passed by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco

John L. Taylor
Clerk

File No.
101-92-81

JUN 16 1993
Date Approved

Frank M. Jordan
Mayor

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

DOCUMENTS DEPT.
JUL 09 1993
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

FILE NO. 127-93-2 ORDINANCE NO. 199-93

[New Jobs Tax Credit]

AMENDING PART III OF THE SAN FRANCISCO MUNICIPAL CODE BY ADDING SECTIONS 906B AND 1005.6 TO ADD CREDITS FOR NEWLY CREATED JOBS TO OFFSET BUSINESS TAX AND PAYROLL EXPENSE TAX LIABILITIES.

Note: The following sections are entirely new.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. Part III of the San Francisco Municipal Code is hereby amended to add sections 906B and 1005.6 to read as follows:

SECTION 906B. NEW JOBS TAX CREDIT.

(a) Purpose. The purpose of this provision is to increase the number of permanent jobs (which in no case shall be a job lasting less than two years) within the City and County of San Francisco by providing an incentive for businesses to create or relocate jobs in San Francisco that otherwise would be situated elsewhere. As the Board of Supervisors encourages businesses to consider the placement of San Francisco residents in jobs which are created or relocated and which result in tax credits as provided in this section.

(b) General rule. (i) Any business, as defined in Section 902.2 of Part III of the Municipal Code, shall be allowed a credit against the Payroll Expense Tax for each new job created on or after July 1, 1993; however, in no event shall the tax credit reduce a taxpayer's liability for such tax to less than zero. Each taxpayer claiming the tax credit shall file with the

Tax Collector, on a form prescribed by the Tax Collector, an affidavit under penalty of perjury attesting to the facts required by the Tax Collector to establish the taxpayer's entitlement to the tax credit consistent with this section and regulations adopted by the Tax Collector.

(ii) No business shall be allowed a credit under this section for any job which previously had been performed in San Francisco for a predecessor employer.

(c) Amount of credit. (i) For purposes of this section, the amount of the new jobs tax credit for any given year, subject to the conditions below, shall be a percentage of the additional Payroll Expense Tax that otherwise would be due (assuming for this purpose that the Business Tax does not apply) for an individual hired after July 1, 1993 for a job qualifying for the credit based on the employee's duration of employment as follows:

DURATION OF EMPLOYMENT	TAX CREDIT
FIRST 12 MONTHS	100%
SECOND 12 MONTHS	50%

(ii) For purposes of this section, the "base year liability" for any given tax year shall be the employer's highest Payroll Tax liability (exclusive of any credits granted under this provision) for any prior year from 1992 on.

(iii) No credit shall be allowed for any first year of employment to the extent that such credit would reduce the

//

DOCUMENTS DEPT.
JUL 0 9 1993
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

employer's Payroll Tax Expense liability below that employer's base year liability.

(iv) No credit shall be allowed for any second year of employment to the extent that such credit for second year employment and any credits for first year of employment would reduce the employer's Payroll Tax Expense liability below the employer's previous base year liability.

(v) For purposes of this limitation, it shall be presumed that the employer is liable for the Payroll Expense Tax, regardless of the Business Tax.

(d) Small business tax exemption. If after the new jobs tax credit the net tax does not exceed $2,500, and the taxpayer is a "small business enterprise" as defined in Section 905-A of this part, the taxpayer shall be exempt from taxation under this ordinance.

(e) Regulations. The Tax Collector is directed to adopt and promulgate and to enforce rules and regulations relating to the application of this section including provisions which provide penalties due to fraud, any underpayment of tax, or an intent to evade this ordinance or authorized rules and regulations. The Board of Review, consisting of the Chief Administrative Officer, the Controller and the Assessor, and as provided for in Section 913 of this code, shall approve, modify or disapprove the rules and regulations prescribed by the Tax Collector pursuant to this ordinance. Any rules and regulations

adopted by the Tax Collector shall also be approved by the City Attorney, and further provided that any modifications determined by the Board of Review shall be approved as to legal form by the City Attorney. The rules and regulations shall become effective 30 days after receipt by the Clerk of the Board, unless the Board of Supervisors disapproves or modifies the regulations. The Board of Supervisors' determination to modify or disapprove a rule or regulation submitted by the Tax Collector pursuant to this ordinance shall not impair the ability of the Tax Collector to submit the same or a similar rule or regulation to the Board of Supervisors if the Tax Collector determines it is necessary to effectuate the purpose of this ordinance.

(f) Report on effect of tax credit. The Tax Collector shall submit a report to the Board of Supervisors on May 31, 1994, and every year thereafter for which the tax credit is available, which evaluates the effect of the tax credit on employment and local tax revenues. The Tax Collector shall also make available to the Board of Supervisors the aggregate information of the dollar value of the new jobs tax credits claimed each year by businesses.

(g) Expiration. The New Jobs Tax Credit provided in this section shall expire on December 31, 1997, unless the Board of Supervisors extends the credit.

SECTION 1005.6. NEW JOBS TAX CREDIT.

//

(a) Purpose. The purpose of this provision is to increase the number of permanent jobs (which in no case shall be a job lasting less than two years) within the City and County of San Francisco by providing an incentive for businesses to create or relocate jobs in San Francisco that otherwise would be situated elsewhere.

(b) General rule. (i) Any business, as defined in Section 1002.1 of Part III of the Municipal Code, shall be allowed a credit against the Business Tax for each new job created on or after July 1, 1993; however, in no event shall the tax credit reduce a taxpayer's liability for such tax to less than zero. Each taxpayer claiming the tax credit shall file with the Tax Collector, on a form prescribed by the Tax Collector, an affidavit under penalty of perjury attesting to the facts required by the Tax Collector to establish the taxpayer's entitlement to the tax credit consistent with this section and regulations adopted by the Tax Collector.

(ii) No business shall be allowed a credit under this section for any job which previously had been performed in San Francisco for a predecessor employer.

(c) Amount of credit. (i) For purposes of this section, the amount of the new jobs tax credit for any given year, subject to the conditions below, shall be a percentage of the additional Payroll Expense Tax that otherwise would be due (assuming for this purpose that the Business Tax does not apply) for an

individual hired after July 1, 1993 for a job qualifying for the credit based on the employee's duration of employment as follows:

DURATION OF EMPLOYMENT	TAX CREDIT
FIRST 12 MONTHS	100%
SECOND 12 MONTHS	50%

(ii) For purposes of this section, the "base year liability" for any given tax year shall be the employer's highest Payroll Tax liability (exclusive of any credits granted under this provision) for any prior year from 1992 on.

(iii) No credit shall be allowed for any first year of employment to the extent that such credit would reduce the employer's Payroll Tax Expense liability below that employer's base year liability.

(iv) No credit shall be allowed for any second year of employment to the extent that such credit for second year employment and any credits for first year of employment would reduce the employer's Payroll Tax Expense liability below the employer's previous base year liability.

(v) For purposes of this limitation, it shall be presumed that the employer is liable for the Payroll Expense Tax, regardless of the Business Tax.

(d) Small business tax exemption. If after the new jobs tax credit the net tax does not exceed $2,500, and the taxpayer is a "small business enterprise" as defined in Section 1005.3 of

//

this part, the taxpayer shall be exempt from taxation under this Ordinance.

(e) Special Regulations. The Tax Collector is directed to adopt and promulgate and to enforce rules and regulations relating to the application of this section including provisions which provide penalties due to fraud, any underpayment of tax, or an intent to evade this ordinance or authorized rules and regulations. The Board of Review, consisting of the Chief Administrative Officer, the Controller and the Assessor, and as provided for in Section 1018 of this code, shall approve, modify or disapprove the rules and regulations prescribed by the Tax Collector pursuant to this ordinance. Any rules and regulations adopted by the Tax Collector shall also be approved by the City Attorney, and further provided that any modifications determined by the Board of Review shall be approved as to legal form by the City Attorney. The rules and regulations shall become effective 30 days after receipt by the Clerk of the Board, unless the Board of Supervisors disapproves or modifies the regulations. The Board of Supervisors' determination to modify or disapprove a rule or regulation submitted by the Tax Collector pursuant to this ordinance shall not impair the ability of the Tax Collector to submit the same or a similar rule or regulation to the Board of Supervisors if the Tax Collector determines it is necessary to effectuate the purpose of this ordinance.

//

(f) Report on effect of tax credit. The Tax Collector shall submit a report to the Board of Supervisors on May 31, 1994, and every year thereafter for which the tax credit is available, which evaluates the effect of the tax credit on employment and local tax revenues. The Tax Collector shall also make available to the Board of Supervisors the aggregate information of the dollar value of the new jobs tax credits claimed each year by businesses.

(g) Expiration. The New Jobs Tax Credit provided in this section shall expire on December 31, 1997, unless the Board of Supervisors extends the credit.

APPROVED AS TO FORM

LOUISE H. RENNE
City Attorney

By _____
CLAUDE F. KOLM
Deputy City Attorney

Board of Supervisors, San Francisco

Passed for Second Reading	§	Finally Passed
	§	
June 1, 1993	§	June 7, 1993
	§	
	§	
Ayes: Supervisors Alioto Bierman Hsieh Kaufman Maher Migden Shelley	§	Ayes: Supervisors Alioto Conroy Hsieh Kaufman Kennedy Leal Maher Migden Shelley
	§	
Noes: Supervisor Hallinan	§	Noes: Supervisor Hallinan
	§	
Absent: Supervisors Conroy Kennedy Achtenberg	§	Absent: Supervisor Bierman
	§	

I hereby certify that the foregoing ordinance was finally passed by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco

Clerk

File No.
127-93-2

JUN 1 0 1993
Date Approved

Mayor

FILE NO. 127-93-3 ORDINANCE NO. 200-93

[Enterprise Zone, Tax Credit]

AMENDING SECTION 906A OF ARTICLE 12-A OF PART III OF THE SAN FRANCISCO MUNICIPAL CODE (PAYROLL EXPENSE TAX ORDINANCE) BY INCREASING TAX CREDITS FOR PERSONS WHO MAINTAIN A FIXED PLACE OF BUSINESS WITHIN THE SAN FRANCISCO ENTERPRISE ZONE AND WHO CREATE NEW JOBS AND HIRE EMPLOYEES QUALIFIED UNDER SPECIFIED GOVERNMENT JOBS PROGRAMS; AND AMENDING SECTION 1005.5 OF ARTICLE 12-B OF PART III OF THE SAN FRANCISCO MUNICIPAL CODE (BUSINESS TAX ORDINANCE) BY INCREASING TAX CREDITS FOR PERSONS WHO MAINTAIN A FIXED PLACE OF BUSINESS WITHIN THE SAN FRANCISCO ENTERPRISE ZONE AND WHO CREATE NEW JOBS AND HIRE EMPLOYEES QUALIFIED UNDER SPECIFIED GOVERNMENT JOBS PROGRAMS.

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are <u>underlined</u>; deletions are in ((double parentheses)).

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. <u>Section 906A of</u> Article 12-A of Part III of the <u>San Francisco</u> Municipal Code (Payroll Expense Tax Ordinance) is hereby amended ((by adding Section 906A thereof)) to read as follows:

SEC. 906A. ENTERPRISE ZONE TAX CREDIT.

(a) A credit against this tax shall be allowed for each person who maintains a fixed place of business within the San Francisco Enterprise Zone and who, on or after January 1, 1992, creates one or more new jobs and hires employees who qualify under Subsection (b) of this section; provided, however, that in no event shall the tax credit reduce a person's tax liability to less than zero. Moreover,

Supervisors Kaufman, Alioto, Shelley, Kennedy

the tax credits shall only serve as an offset against the additional tax that would be paid as a result of additional hiring by a business within the zone. Each person claiming this credit shall file with the Tax Collector, on a form prescribed by the Tax Collector, an affidavit attesting to facts establishing his or her entitlement to the tax credit; said affidavit shall be supported by state tax credit forms (EDD, DSS, and PIC).

(b) An employee is a "qualified employee" for purposes of computing this tax credit if he or she is newly hired by the taxpayer on or after January 1, 1992 and either (1) is receiving subsidized employment training or services under the terms of the Federal Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA); or (2) is registered in the Greater Avenues for Independence (GAIN) Program; or (3) is certified by the Employment Development Department as eligible for the federal Targeted Jobs Tax Credit Program (TJTC); or (4) General Assistance recipients.

(c) The tax credit, for each qualified employee, shall be a varying percentage of the additional tax that would be incurred as a result of additional wages paid for work performed within the Enterprise Zone, and the dollar amount of such tax credit shall depend both upon the duration of employment as of the date payroll taxes are due, and the eligible wages paid, as follows:

(1) The eligible wages to which the percentage is applied shall be limited to wages paid for work performed by the qualified employee while physically present within San Francisco.

DOCUMENTS DEPT.
JUL 09 1993
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

(2) The percentage to be applied to eligible wages shall depend upon the employee's duration of employment as follows:

Duration of Employment	Credit Allowed On Payroll Tax Liability
First ((12)) 24 Months	((50%)) 100%
Second ((12)) 24 Months	((40%)) 50%
Third ((12)) 24 Months	((30%)) 25%
Fourth ((12)) 24 Months	((20%)) 15%
Fifth ((12)) 24 Months	10%
((After 60 Months))	((0%))

Section 2. Section 1005.5 of Article 12-B of Article III of the San Francisco Municipal Code (Business Tax Ordinance) is hereby amended ((by adding Section 1005.5 thereto,)) to read as follows:

SEC. 1005.5. ENTERPRISE ZONE TAX CREDIT.

(a) A credit against this tax shall be allowed for each person who maintains a fixed place of business within the San Francisco Enterprise Zone and who, on or after January 1, 1992, creates one or more new jobs and hires employees who qualify under subsection (b) of this section; provided, however, that in no event shall the tax credit reduce a person's tax liability to less than zero. Each person claiming this credit shall file with the Tax Collector, on a form prescribed by the Tax Collector, an affidavit attesting to facts establishing his or her entitlement to the tax credit; said affidavit shall be supported by State tax credit forms (EDD, DSS, and PIC).

(b) An employee is a "qualified employee" for purposes of computing this tax credit if he or she is newly hired by the

taxpayer on or after January 1, 1992 and either (1) is receiving subsidized employment training or services under the terms of the Federal Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA); or (2) is registered in the Greater Avenues for Independence (GAIN) Program; or (3) is certified by the Employment Development Department as eligible for the federal Targeted Jobs Tax Credit Program (TJTC); or (4) General Assistance recipients.

(c) The tax credit, for each qualified employee, shall be a varying percentage of wages paid for work performed within the Enterprise Zone, and the dollar amount of such tax credit shall depend both upon the duration of employment as of the date the gross receipts taxes are due, and the eligible wages paid, as follows:

(1) The eligible wages to which the percentage is applied shall be limited to wages paid for work performed by the qualified employee while physically present within San Francisco.

///
///
///
///
///
///
///
///
///
///

(2) The percentage to be applied to eligible wages shall depend upon the employee's duration of employment as follows:

Duration of Employment	Credit Allowed On Gross Receipts Tax Liability
First ((12)) 24 Months	((50%)) 100%
Second ((12)) 24 Months	((40%)) 50%
Third ((12)) 24 Months	((30%)) 25%
Fourth ((12)) 24 Months	((20%)) 15%
Fifth ((12)) 24 Months	10%
((After 60 Months))	((0%))

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

LOUISE H. RENNE
City Attorney

By: Leslie Trutner
LESLIE B. TRUTNER
Deputy City Attorney

Board of Supervisors, San Francisco

Passed for Second Reading	Finally Passed
June 1, 1993	June 7, 1993
Ayes: Supervisors Alioto Bierman Hsieh Kaufman Maher Migden Shelley	Ayes: Supervisors Alioto Conroy Hsieh Kaufman Kennedy Leal Maher Migden Shelley
Noes: Supervisor Hallinan	Noes: Supervisor Hallinan
Absent: Supervisors Conroy Kennedy Achtenberg	Absent: Supervisor Bierman

I hereby certify that the foregoing ordinance was finally passed by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco

John L. Taylor
Clerk

JUN 10 1993
Date Approved

Frank M. Jordan
Mayor

File No.
127-93-3

6609.6

Omaha, Ne
Houchen
Bindery Ltd
2012